

Case No. SA-1A-Reg

DOI: 10.1002/for





## THE NUMBER OF RASAS



॥ श्री गुरुभ्यो नमः ॥  
"East and West"

# THE NUMBER OF RASAS

BY

V. RAGHAVAN, M.A., Ph.D.

*Department of Sanskrit, University of Madras*

WITH A FOREWORD BY

PROF. M. HIRIYANNA, M.A.

*Formerly Professor of Sanskrit, Maharaja's College, Mysore*

7806

504A  
Rag

THE ADYAR LENDON. ADYAR LENDON

THE ADYAR LENDON. ADYAR LENDON

CENTRAL AMERICAN  
LIBRARY NEW DELHI

Box No. 7826

Date 19-8-76

Vol. No. 504/1/1

Printed by  
C. S. S. S. S.  
At the Central Press,  
Allah, Madras.

## FOREWORD

I GLADLY respond to the desire of Dr. Taghavan that I should contribute a Foreword to this book. He has been carrying on researches in the field of Sanskrit literary criticism for several years past, and the material which he has brought together here shows how extensive is his acquaintance with the literature on the subject. He draws his data, it will be seen, from unpublished manuscripts as readily as he does from published works. The opinion formed on any aspect of the subject by one, who has devoted so much time to its study and whose knowledge of it is so wide, is of special value and deserves the careful attention of all scholars.

The particular problem considered here is that of the number of rasas, and its consideration necessarily involves the discussion of many important points relating to their nature and scope. As in the case of other problems investigated by the ancient Indians, we find here also an astounding variety of solutions. While some thinkers have held that there is but one rasa, others have maintained that the rasas are many, there being a wide divergence of opinion respecting their exact number. The usual view, however, is that there are eight rasas or rītas, with the addition of what is termed vibhakti.

सुखात्मानमननस्य रीदधीत्यननस्यः ।

रीदधीत्यननस्य रीदधीत्यननस्यः ।



Although Dr. Bhaṭṭarāyaṇ considers all these views more or less in detail, the main part of his discussion is concerned with the admissibility of *śūdras* as the ninth *varṇa*. His treatment of the question is quite comprehensive, and he examines it both from the historical and the metaphysical sides. A brief reference to each of these may not be out of place.

Owing to the uncertainty of our knowledge of the early phases of Indian classical literature, it is not possible to say when poets began to portray this *varṇa*. The epic and mythic elements, however, which form its distinctive basis, are very old features of Indian life; and they were highly valued by those who followed the teaching of the Veda as well as by those who did not. So we may assume that the *śūdras* attitude toward *varṇas* in literature quite early; and this is corroborated by the works of Jarrughopa even II, on account of its chronological indefiniteness, we leave out of consideration the Mahābhārata, the usual example given of the *śūdras* *varṇa*. As regards writers on Purāṇa, the earliest to recognize it definitely, so far as our knowledge at present goes, was Uśānasa. Possibly its recognition by them was even earlier. Bhāṭṭarāyaṇ's view in the matter is somewhat doubtful, by reason of the unsatisfactory character of the text of the *Śaṅkara* *śāstra* as it has come down to us. Some manuscripts of it mention only eight *varṇas*, but others nine. The weight of evidence bearing on the point seems, on the whole, to be on the former side, and Dr. Bhaṭṭarāyaṇ adduces several convincing arguments to show that the references to this *varṇa* in Bhāṭṭarāyaṇ are all spurious. But it should be added that the *Māhātmya* contains nearly all the essential points necessary for a theoretical formulation of it.

Before we pass on to the aesthetic aspect of the question, it is desirable to distinguish the emotive content or theme of

a literary work from the aesthetic statement which, according to the prevalent Indian view, its idealised representation evokes in the reader or the spectator. Thus in the case of the *Śakuntalam*, Durgamā's love for Śakuntalā forms the chief theme while the emotion, which it evokes in us as we witness the drama enacted, is sympathy. When we ask whether *śrīrāsa* can be a *rasa*, we mean whether situations in life involving the qualities of sentiment lead themselves to be similarly dealt with in literature. If they do, then *śrīrāsa* is a *rasa*; otherwise, it is not. The practice of great poets like Kālidāsa, which is after all the true teststone in such matters, shows that *śrīrāsa* situations can certainly be thus delineated in literary works. In the last act of his play, just alluded to, Kālidāsa describes the tranquillity and balance of Mitrān's burnings in a manner which affects us most profoundly. But, however splendidly depicted, the *śrīrāsa* case occupies only a subordinate place there; and a doubt may therefore arise whether it can be the leading sentiment in a work, i.e. whether it can be portrayed in such a manner that it will impress us at the end as the predominant element in the unity of *rasa* which, according to the Indian view, every work of art is expected to achieve. Some of the works of Jagganna, to whom I have already referred, show that it can be so represented. The *Mahābhārata* also, at any rate in its present form, illustrates the same truth, as set forth by Anandavardhana in his masterly way in the last section of his *Dhvanyāloka*.

Yet there were theorists who denied that the *śrīrāsa* could be an *art* emotion. It is hardly necessary to examine their arguments when we have the practice of great poets and the opinion of great art critics to the contrary. But a reference should be made to one of them which appears, at first sight, to prove some force. This argument is that the attitude of

mood for which *ekata* stands is altogether a rare one, and that its representation is not cannot therefore appeal to more than a very few. The objection, it is obvious, is based on the supposition that the test of true art is in the wideness of its appeal. The advocates of *ekata* break this argument aside usually by saying that such questions are not to be decided by a plurality; but, by thus admitting the narrowness of its appeal, they seem to give up their position. They conclude that *ekata* is a rare is inevitable. Indeed, it would have been a strange way of circumstances if Indian, of all, had excluded it from the sphere of art. The way in which this particular objection is met, however, is not satisfactory. May it be that the contention that the appeal of *ekata* is only to a very few is wrong? Its unshared occasion in life—whether it be one of joy or one of sorrow—passes without bringing home to man the supreme desirability of spiritual peace. It means that the need for such peace is fundamental to the human heart; and this conclusion is confirmed by the pure satisfaction which the contemplation, for example, of the images of Buddha in meditative repose brings to so many. If so, the *ekata* mood is by no means uncommon; and the *ekata* mood need not be an exception to the rule that the appeal of art is general. What is uncommon is the capacity in man to capture that mood and cultivate it, so that it may come to prevail over all other moods; but this deficiency does not matter so far as art is concerned for it has the power, of itself, to enable him to attain, albeit only for a while, the peace of spirit which, as an old Indian *uttha* has observed, even a piglet has to attain himself long to man.

Dr. Raghavan makes a valuable contribution to the study not merely of Sanskrit literary criticism but of Indian Aesthetics as a whole, for the conception of *rasa*, though it is

how dealt with chiefly in its relation to poetry, is general and furnishes the criterion by which the worth of all forms of fine art may be judged. I have no doubt that the book will be read and appreciated very widely.

M. H.



## PREFACE

Rasa, Anandya and Dhvani form the three great contributions of Sanskrit Alankāra Śāstra to the subject of Literary Criticism. Rasa is the very 'soul' (Ātman) of poetry and drama. Of the concept of Rasa, one aspect namely the number of the Rasas—whether they are only the eight mentioned by Dhvani or are more—is studied in the following pages. The study now and then does necessarily touch some incidental aspects of the concept of Rasa also.

This study was originally published in the form of articles in the *Journal of Oriental Research, Madras*. It was suggested to me that I might bring them out in book-form. That they have appeared now in book-form is due to the kindness of Dr. Srinivasa Murthi, Director, Adyar Library, to whom my thanks are due for the realisation of this publication in the Adyar Library Series. I must thank also Dr. C. Keshava Raja, D. Phil., Reader in Sanskrit, University of Madras and Curator, Adyar Library.

Thanks are also due to the authorities of the *Journal of Oriental Research, Madras*, and to the authorities of the University of Madras for permitting the publication.

Madras  
1977-40 }

V. RAGHAVAN



## SYNOPSIS

### I

#### THE ADVENT OF ŚHĪTA

ŚHARATA mentioned only eight Kama and Kālidāsa knew only eight Kama. Śaṅkha describes and illustrates only eight Kama. (p. 1) Śhārata says that Śrīṅgita etc. are the eight Kama mentioned by Bhaṭṭara. What is the significance of the mention of Bhaṭṭara here? (p. 2) The names Śa'kha, Śa'kha, Śhārata and Tapa in the history of Miya literature. (pp. 2-3) The question whether Tapa and Śaṅkharāma are identical. (pp. 3-4) Śhārata's reference to Śaṅkharāma as the first exponent of Kama and its explanation. (pp. 4-5) Śhārata the first to speak of the Śhita rasa according to Śhārata. (pp. 11-12) Kālidāsa and Śhita. (p. 13) The questions which arise regarding the Śhita rasa. (pp. 13-14)

### II

#### THE CONTROVERSY OVER ŚHĪTA

Śhārata did not mention the Śhita rasa, the Śhita rasa in Śhārata are interpolations. (pp. 15-16) But śhita related to Śhita are present in Śhārata's accepted text, paragraphs recognising the constant element, in Śhārata. (pp. 16-17) The real nature of Śhārata's change is similar to Śhārata



also explains in his commentary. The unfolding of Shiva stage by stage. The view of the Candolita on the Dhanuṣṭhita that Shiva can only be the secondary motive (pp. 26-27)

Probably the Buddhists and the Jains were responsible for making Shiva the sixth Kām. The Śaundaryananda kīya, the Uṣṭipāra pāṭhaṇa and the fragment of an allegorical drama of Anurāgana. The Jaina Anurāgadeśika edition of the 8th cent. A. D. mentions the Shiva rām. The probable theories who might have introduced the Shiva rām - Kāśhā? Śrīkṛṣṇa the Vātsīyāśīla? It is likely that it was the play Nityamāda which was responsible for starting the discussion on Shiva. (pp. 21-24)

The objections to Shiva becoming a Kām and the replies to these objections. (pp. 24-26) Literature-depicting Shiva, Kīya and Nityamāda. (pp. 26-42)

The writers who accept Shiva and those who reject it (pp. 42-47); the view that it is admissible as Kīya but not in drama (pp. 47-5); the view that Shiva is a Kām but can be included in one of the eight old Kāmas (the Anurāgadeśika view). (pp. 47-5)

The Rāmāyaṇa relatives, the Uṣṭipāra relatives, Darvata, Vāra, Vṛṣi and Gṛha of Shiva. Harapala's definition of the six Kāmas, the counterpart of the Shiva rām. (pp. 49-50)

### III

#### SOME PECULIAR AND ORIGINAL VIEWS ON SHIVA

The peculiar and original view on Shiva is the (1) Kām Kāśhā of Rāma Maṇḍa, (2) Saṅgita-saṅgīta of Harapala, (3) Pāṇḍita kīya and (4) Anurāgadeśika. (pp. 53-54)



Shojo's view of *Rasa* is S. E. A and Sij. For His Uddita and Uddita *Rasa*, his acceptance of *Shata* and *Prapa*. These four *Rasa* are accepted for the four types of love, Uddita, Uddita, Lata and *Shata*. His acceptance of *Shata*'s position, not only *Vidyacharya* and *Shata*, but many other states his *Shata* and *Prapa* are considered as *Rasa* by Shojo. The largest number of *Rasa* to be seen in Shojo. The accommodation of this view in his main theory of an *Alakara* *Rasa*. Shojo's critique of the old view that only a few, *Rasa* etc., are *Shata*. (pp. 120-121) A state of chaos in the world of *Rasa*, recorded by *Alakara* in his *Locana*. (pp. 121-122)

Critique of the above view; clear statement of the theory of *Shata* and *Rasa*, according to *Shata* and *Alakara*. (pp. 122-123) *Shata* proposing to such as *Shata* to avoid a complete overthrow of the system. (pp. 123-4)

*Shata* and *Madhura* *Rasa*; the *Vaquer* *Shata* of *Shata* (pp. 125-126); *Madhura* *Shata* on *Shata* *Rasa*. (pp. 126-127)

The *Madhura* *Rasa*,—*Shata* and *Shata* (pp. 127-128); the *Shata* *Rasa*. (p. 128)

The *Shata* *Rasa* in the *Shata* *Shata* and its commentary by *Madhura* *Shata*. (pp. 129-130)

## VII

### THE VARIETIES OF THE SAME *RASA*

I. King *Shata*'s three different *Rasa*, *Shata* *Shata* and *Vidyacharya*; the question of *Shata* and the question whether all *Rasa* are plausible; *Vidyacharya*

never *Śāṅkshyapāṇi* on *Rasāśāstra*; the *Rasāśāstra* holding some *Rasa* to be *pāṇḍit*. (pp. 144-150)

2. The varieties of *Rāga*, *Rasāṅga*, *Rāgyānta*, *Rāghata*, and *Rāghata*. (pp. 150-5)

3. The varieties of *Vina*,—*Dasa*, *Dāsaṅga*, and *Yuddha*; *Vina*; *Daya* *Vina*, *Jaṅgama* on the possibility of numerous other *Vina*. The *Ananyagadha* on *Vina* and its varieties. (pp. 151-153)

4. *Māṅgalya* on the three forms of all *Rasa*, *Vedha*, *Nipadyāṅga* and *Śāṅkshyapāṇi*. (p. 153)

5. *Dāsaṅga* *Śāṅkshyapāṇi*, *Artha* *Śāṅkshyapāṇi* and *Kāra* *Śāṅkshyapāṇi* in *Rasāṅga*, *Māṅgalya* *Śāṅkshyapāṇi* also in *Rasāṅga*. (pp. 153-4)

## VIII

### ARE ALL *RASA* PLEASURABLE?

Are all *Rasa* pleasurable or are there some which are *pāṇḍit*? The *Nipadyāṅga* and the *Rasāśāstra* hold that some are *pāṇḍit*. (pp. 155-6) *Madhusūdana* *Saṅgātā*'s consideration of the question of *Rasa* in *Rasa* from the view points of the *Śāṅkshyapāṇi* and the *Vedha*. All *Rasa* are pleasurable. (pp. 156-7)

## IX

### NEW TRANSCENDENT AND SATTVA

Enumeration of the three categories of *Rasāṅga* distinguished as *Sāṅkshyapāṇi*, *Vybhāṅgīya* and *Sāṅkshyapāṇi*. Reduction of the *Vybhāṅgīya* and addition to the same. (pp. 158-9) The distinction into *Vybhāṅgīya* and *Sāṅkshyapāṇi*. The addition to

the set 'Eksha, Shiva etc.' by Eksha, Padmasri, Shaja and Virendra. Ekshodatta's inclusion of the ten Madana-avadhuta in Tyakshidatta. (p. 134) Ekshodatta's new Tyakshidatta, Chala. (p. 143) The meaning of the name Shatvika. Ekshodatta's additional Shatvika, Jambhi. Ekshodatta's distinction Eksha & Capli. (pp. 143-4)

## K

### KASHI-SYSTEM

Attempts at postulating one Kasi in the Pancha and the rest as Vajra. (p. 144) The Kashi-system and Ekshodatta. (pp. 145-5) The Vata-systems of Aksharvagupta. (pp. 151-7) The Akshata-Syngata-systems of Shaja. (pp. 157-6) The Prasa-systems of Shaja. (pp. 166-170) The Kasi-Syngata-systems in the Agni period. (pp. 171-2) The Akshata-systems of Nadyasa. (pp. 172-3) Criticism of attempts at such systems. (p. 173)

Kasi as such is only one. (pp. 174-5)

## ABBREVIATIONS AND SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

*Of Sanskrit Works only some are included here for abbreviating the abbreviations ; for the rest, see Index of Sanskrit Works and Authors.*

*Abhi. Bhāṣ.* = *Abhinavabhāṣa*, Abhinavapada's commentary on the *Nāṭya śāstra*.

*Adyar* = A Catalogue of Sanskrit MSS. in the Adyar Library. 2 Parts.

*A. K. , A. Kani, Akani, Kani.* = *Ākṣarābhāṣāśāstra* of Kaṇvadeya-  
pāda.

*Alma* = A Catalogue of the Sanskrit MSS. in the Library of H. H.  
the Maharaja of Alma. Dr. Peter Preuss.

*A. P.* = *Apri. Prāṇa*.

*Ābh.* = *Ābhīkṣa*, *Śāstrīya*, *Sāra*, *Śāstrīya*, *Śāstrīya* (M).

*Asat.* = The Asatya's Catalogue Catalogue.

*Āst. Pr.* = *Āst. Prāṇa*, *Prāṇa* of Śāstrīya.

*Ban. Dr. B. A. S.* = A Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit and Pāli-  
MSS. in the Library of the Bombay Branch of the Royal  
Asiatic Society. Prof. H. D. Velankar.

*Dr. Mr. Pr. Dr. Cat.* = Catalogue of Sanskrit, Pāli and Pāli-  
(Printed) Books in the British Museum.

*Brāhminśāstra* *Brāhminśāstra* *Brāhminśāstra* Prof. H. Lohm. 1911.

*Cat.* = Catalogue.

*Catalogue of the Collections of MSS. deposited in the Decatur  
College, (Pooné) S. R. Bhambhani.*

*Catalogue of MSS. from Gujarat, Kachchh, Sindh and Kashmir.  
O. Böcher. 4 Parts.*

Catalogue Sommaire Des Manuscrits Sanscrits Et Pâlis. A. Calcutta. Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris. 3 Parts

Cop. = Commentary

CPS. Harsid = Catalogue of Sanskrit and Pâli MSS. in the Central Province and Deccan. Prof. Subhadra Harsid

Descriptive Catalogue of the Sanskrit MSS. in the Vaidya Samithi. Poona, Calcutta. Prof. Chaudharna Chakravarti, M.A.

Edm. A. = Edupâdikâ of Anandavardhana

E. H. = Dâkshinâ of Dharmâjaya

E. H. A. = Dâkshinâdikâ of Dharmâjaya

Gad. vol. } = Gaudard Gaudard Series Edition  
Gad

Gaudardâdikâ. Adish. Pundarik. Dargachar. Jala. Saravast. Harina. Jalaputra

History of Indian Literature. Dr. H. Winternitz. English Translation. Calcutta University. Part Two

History of Sanskrit Literature. Dr. A. B. Keith

Hps. Harsid. II. Sans. = History of Sanskrit Mss. (second series) Mrs. Haraprasad Sarsid

Hps. Report. 1895-1900 = Report for the Search of Sanskrit Mss. 1895-1900. Mrs. Haraprasad Sarsid

IQJ = India. History Quarterly, Calcutta

Introduction (on the History of Aikâdikâ Mss.) in an Edition of the Shiksha. Dargachar. P. V. Kari

IS = Catalogue of Sanskrit and Pâli MSS. in the Library of the India Office 3 Parts

Jana. Gaudardâdikâ

JOR = Journal of Oriental Research, Madras

Journal of the Asian Research Society

Journal of the Music Academy, Madras

JRS = Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland, London

K. A. = { Kâryâdikâ of Dharmâjaya  
" " " " Dharmâjaya  
Kâryâdikâ of Harinavastha

- K. Ā. = Kāvyaśāstra of Dhanva  
 K. A. S. S. = Kāvyaśāstrāśāstra samgraha of Udaya  
 K. M. = Kāvya-mīmāṃsā of Kāyaśikhara  
 K. M. Edn. = Kāvyaśāstra Edition  
 K. Pra. = Kāvyaśāstrāśāstra of Maheśvara  
 Mad. MS. = MS. in the Madras Govt. Oriental MSS. Library  
 MDCC = Descriptive Sanskrit Catalogue of the Madras Govt. Oriental MSS. Library  
 M. S. = Madhuśūdhana Sansarati  
 MTCC = Truncated Sanskrit Catalogue of the Madras Govt. Oriental MSS. Library  
 Mysore = Catalogue of Sanskrit MSS. in the Govt. Oriental Library, Mysore. 2 Parts  
 N. D. = Nāṭya Darpaṇa of Hamaśāstra and Gaṇaśāstra  
 Nāṭya, Mīm. = Nāṭya of Sanskrit MS. by Dr. Rāghavabāla Mīm.  
 N. S. = Nāṭya śāstra of Bharata  
 N. S. = Nāṭya Saṅgṛha Press, Bombay  
 N. W. Provincial Cat. = A. Catalogue of Sanskrit MSS. in Private Libraries of the North Western Provinces  
 Opper = List of Sanskrit MSS. in Private Libraries of Southern India by Gustav Opper. 2 Parts  
 Oxford = Catalogue Codicum Sanscritorum Bibliothecae Bodleianae. Th. Ashtachi  
 Patana = Report of Operations in Search of Sanskrit MS. in the Moulvi Circle. Dr. Peter Paterson. 16 Reports  
 R. A. S. = Rājya-samitiśāstra of Vāṅmāhātmya  
 Report of a Second Tour in Search of Sanskrit MSS. made in Rajasthan and Central India in 1904-6. S. R. Khasturkar  
 R. G. = Rājyaśāstrāśāstra of Jayasiddha  
 Ruc. = Catalogue of Sanskrit MSS. in Mysore and Coorg. L. Rice  
 R. T. = Rām Tārāgopi of Bhāskara  
 Śāh = Śāhīnāth of Kāśīnāth  
 Śha. Kāśīnāth = Śhaṅkara Kāśīnāth of Ichāmadhyakṣa  
 S. D. = Śāṭhya Darpaṇa of Vāṅmāhātmya  
 S. K. Ā. = Śaṅkarachāṅgyakāśikāśāstra of Bhāṣa



S. M. =Śārngya, Mithanāth

Sy. =Śrīngiya

Sy. Pra. =Śrīngiya, Prabodha of Dhosa

S. R. =Śaṅkha, Rasthānā of Śārngya

Sain. =Catalogue of the Sanskrit MSS. in the Śaṅkhaśāstra, Temple Library of H. H. the Maharaja of Jammu and Kashmir, M. A. Sain.

Sain. in the Library of Sanskrit Poets, 2 Parts. Ed. S. R. De Tāpasa New Coll. =Desampara Catalogue of the Sanskrit MSS. in the Tāpasa Maharaja Sastry's Sanskrit Mahāli Library, Tanjore

Trasacasa Candor's List =Catalogue of Sanskrit MSS. collected by the Candor for the publication of Sanskrit MSS., Trisacasa

Tib. =Tibetan Sanskrit Series

U. R. C. }  
U. R. Caria } =Uttaraśāstra caria of Kāśaśāstra

Vyt. =Vyākhyāna

# ERRATA

Page	Line	Read
7	1	<i>Stichodactylus</i>
8	25	Tilapia
12	1	type of <i>Vanda</i>
	13	<del>1999</del>
23	32	" <i>Sarcus rana alba</i> "
31	25	<i>Asplenium platyneuron</i>
32	34	<del>—<i>g</i>—<i>g</i></del>
33	30	Liliaceae
38	38	<del>1913</del>
41	11	<i>Chrysanthemum</i>
64	38	<i>Staphylinidae</i>
69	24	<i>Thunbergia</i>
73	7	<i>Morinda</i>
82	13	<del>1919</del>
88	21	<i>S. B.</i>
113	26	<i>Staph.</i>
122	5	" <i>V. naga</i> "
124	32	<i>Melastomaceae</i>
125	19	" <i>Phyllanthus albus</i> "
124	11	<i>Croton</i>
129	10 12	<del>—<i>g</i>—<i>g</i></del>
150	27	<i>S. B.</i>
162	38	<i>Scutellaria</i>
167	29	<i>Phyll.</i>

## APPENDIX

P. 56, lines 5-7 and 36-7. *Albizia* var. *Albizia* of *Hesperis* (L.) Mill. in the *Madras Govt. Bot. Library*, E. No. 1315 — E. No. 1311 in another MS. of the same work in the same library in which *Albizia* (L.) Kunt. of *Devanagiri* is given as the author.



# THE NUMBER OF RASAS

## I

For long, the Rasas were only eight in number. The text of the *Nāṭya śāstra* of Bharata originally spoke only of eight Rasas. For a long time, the poets also were speaking only of eight Rasas. Kālidāsa says in his *Vikramorviśākhā* :

दुर्गता जलैव यः कलैर्लभ्ये यथाऽप्यनुसृतान्मयी विदुषः ।

अभिहितैर्न क्वचिदर्थं यदा द्रुमनाः कलैरुपमैः ॥ 11, 12.

Varanasi's *Udhayakāśhāstra* has occasion to mention Rasas and their number. The context is a dramatic context. The Yaj. praises one of the courtesans who is going to meet 'Purnachandrapada' in the temple of Indra at Kanakapura. Rasas are here mentioned as eight in number.

अप्यस्मात्तद् वचनं कुर्यादप्यसौतमपुत्रिभ्रातृभार्यायां द्रुमनां वपुषः,  
पदुर्गताभिर्निरतिदिग्, दुर्गताभिर्नो द्रुमनाम्, यथाऽप्यनुसृतान्मयी विदुषः,  
यद् लाजनि, वसिष्ठान् (-वपुः), जलैर्लभ्ये, कलैर्लभ्ये, कलैर्लभ्ये, कलैर्लभ्ये,  
कलैर्लभ्ये, कलैर्लभ्ये, कलैर्लभ्ये, कलैर्लभ्ये, कलैर्लभ्ये, कलैर्लभ्ये, कलैर्लभ्ये, कलैर्लभ्ये ।

p-13, Caturbhāgi, Madras.

On the side of the theorists, the writers on Poetics, Rasas were only eight upto the time of Śaṅkara who briefly describes and illustrates only the eight Rasas. Naturally, we suppose

that Bhāsa also knew only eight Rāsa. These eight Rāsa are then given by Bhāsa :

सुख-दुःख-मदन-रौद्र-वी-महालक्ष्मी ।  
 मीमांसादुःखं मेघो मेघो गच्छते सा पृथक् ।  
 एते षड्वा सा विधा दुर्दिनेषु मयात्मना ॥

M. D. E. M. Edn. , VI, 15-16.

And then Bhāsa also gives these eight :

दुर्दिनेषु मीमांसा मीमांसादौ वर्यं यथा ।  
 सुख-दुःख-मदन-रौद्र-मीमांसा-महालक्ष्मी ॥ 16-17, VI, 17.

We are unable to fix the exact significance of the second list made by Bhāsa that there are the eight Rāsa expounded by the great Brahman. The mention of Brahman may after all refer only to the legendary background which the Nāga states has created for itself. The very first name says to the effect that about the first exponent of the Nāga states is Brahman :

ब्रह्मर्षी ब्रह्मर्षि ब्रह्मा वेदुर्द्वयम् । 1, 1.

And then Brahman himself learnt from Śiva. This legend is quoted in later times and is mentioned by all writers. How far is this based on evidence within the Nāga states itself ?

To begin with, says Bhāsa says that Brahman himself contemplated and created out of the four Vedas, the fifth Veda called the Nāga Veda. 1, 15-16. Śiva is mentioned in the first chapter, for the first time, with reference to the Kaśīdī Tyāg. Brahman says that the beautiful, graceful and delicate Kaśīdī cannot be properly presented by male actors, that it can be properly done only by actresses and that he has seen it depicted by only one among males, viz., God Śiva. 1, 15.

We hear of Siva again only in Ch. IV. The first drama 'Amarvijaya' or 'Amrta-mahima' was enacted before an audience of Devas and Asuras in Devadatta during the Lakshmi-raga festival I, 24-27.

### सत्यव्रतविजयः सप्त दिवाः प्रीतिः ।

After this Samvratika, the first drama to be staged, was finished, Brahman one day took Bharta and his troops to Kallika to give a performance before God Siva. This Samvratika, and a play called Tripundrika, one of Siva's own exploits, were staged there, IV, 1-12. After the drama was finished, Siva praised Brahman and the actors and told them that the beautiful and varied Karasas and Angulikas of the Tripundra dance which he himself did every evening might be introduced into the Purusanga of their drama, so that their play (Svalbha) Purusanga might become a Citrapurusanga, IV, 11-12. He called upon one of his Ganas, Tardja, to teach Bharta the Angulikas and Karasas of Tripundra, IV, 12-13. Thus Siva is the God of dance proper, while Brahman himself created Drama and won Siva's appreciation for his creation of this art. Bharta is the first artist whom Brahman chose for the exposition of the art that he created. Brahman's creation of the art of Drama referred to all parts of it, the text of the drama, the acting of it, the music that supported the performance and finally the Rasa which the above three evoked in the hearts of the audience. This is the meaning of the verse :

सत्यं वाक्यकृतेष्वाम् वाग्वर्धे मीतमेव न ।

कथुमेवमपि नयाम् कालावर्धेनयामि ॥

\* It is this Amrta-mahima that Kallika makes into the Lakshmi-ragasam in her Vilasamrta-sam.

The story given above points to the historical fact that Dance started first and that Drama was then created. Tagore signs for the link between the two. The gods of the two, Dance and Drama, are *Śiva* and *Brahman*. So it is that Bharata, who represents the operative dance-drama, says at the beginning—

कथं शिवो मेवै विनायकमेषी ।

and Abhinava adds here, in his commentary—

“कथं (कथं) विनिर्दिष्टमस्त्वपिमेति शेषः । कथंस्तु  
विनायकमेषायाः शिवमेषः कथंस्तु कथंस्तु कथंस्तु  
यः कथं कथंस्तु कथंस्तु कथंस्तु कथंस्तु कथंस्तु कथंस्तु ।”

p. 2, *Class. Edn.*, Vol. I.

Thus *Śiva*'s contribution to Dance which served to beautify Drama—*विनायकमेषी यः कथं*. *Brahman*'s contribution here was indispensable for Drama. He spoke of *Text*, *Action*, *Music* and *Rasa*. It is in this part of the Drama of *Brahman* that Bharata refers to Ch. VI, when he says that these are the eight *Rasa* spoken of by *Brahman*.

कथं कथं कथं कथं कथं कथं कथं कथं ।

It is on this part that *Śhivasthāpana* refers when he says that, according to *Brahman*, *Rasa* are only eight, and the ninth, the *Śhiva*, is impossible.

..... कथंस्तु कथंस्तु ।

कथंस्तु कथंस्तु कथंस्तु कथंस्तु ।

*Class. Edn.*, Vol. II, pp. 45-7.

These bits of legend have to be connected with some facts available to us, viz., that there are really big works on *Nāṭya*.

which are current as works of Śiva or Śaṅkara and Brahman Śaṅk. Ma. M. R. Kavi in his Introduction to his edition of the N. R. with the *Abha* Śāh. in the *Cash. Series*.—"We have fragments of both *Brahmaśānta* and *Śaṅkaraśānta*." Abhinava himself refers to the three authorities, Śaṅkara, Brahman and Śānta.

"एतेन सदाशिवसद्व्यवहृतमपनिबर्तेन सत्यसद्व्यवहृति-  
पादयति etc." p. 4.

The upshot of the discussion here gives the noteworthy fact that, of the three works Śaṅkara Śānta, Brahman Śānta and Śānta's *Nitya* śānta, the Brahman Śānta is the best and most important according to some. The *Darsanaphilosophy*, IV, 38 and 39, proving Śānta to be Śaṅkaraśānta, are quoted and attributed to Śaṅkara by Śaṅkaraśānta. Śāh. Pr. VI, p. 132. The ascription does not seem to be reliable. The expansive style of the Śānta śānta argues for a later writer. Whether this particular ascription be true or not, it can be accepted that old works in the name of Śaṅkara and Brahman exist. Though from the internal evidence of the *Nitya* śānta of Śānta we know of Śiva as having constituted Dance only, there may be a Śaṅkara Śānta dealing with all departments of *Nitya*. It is also likely that the Śaṅkara Śānta is of special importance for its chapters on Dance, on *Tijāra*, its *Saraga* and *Adipitā*.

Similarly Tāṇḍa, who, in the *Nitya* śānta, simply passes the *Tijāra* from Śiva to Śānta, may have some old *Nitya* work to his credit. There is some difficulty in understanding the name Tāṇḍa. In Ch. I, we hear of a Tāṇḍa who is one of the hundred sons of Śānta. (I, 25.) From Ch. IV, we know him as belonging to Śiva's camp. In Ch. I, 25, the text has a variant (p. 18, *Cash. edn. 3rd*) Tāṇḍa, and in



Ch. IV, 17 and 18, we have the variant *Tigden* (p. 19, Guck. edn. 8a.1. Alkhanov says that the reading 'Tigden' is appropriate, in view of that word's suitability to the derivation of the word *Tigden*.

"**कवि वरिः तदुपनाम एव पुनः, तदुपनामद्वयविवरणम् ।**"

p. 50, Guck. Edn., Vol. I.

It looks as if "Tigden" was created out of the word *Tigden*. Surely, the *Tigden* was being done by *Shiv* before *Tigden* who, on *Shiv*'s bidding, taught it to *Shanti*. Therefore, the name *Tigden* could not have been the name given to the dance subsequent to *Tigden* imparting it to *Shanti*. In this connection, the text of Alkhanov's commentary seems to say that this *Tigden* is none else than *Shanti*, the chief attendant of *Shiv*. We find in Mr W. E. Kerr's Edn., Vol. I, p. 50: '**तदुपनामौ (वर्णित) तदुपनामौ ।**' But in the MS. of the *Alkhanovskii* in the Madras Govt. Oriental MSS. Library, we find the passage running thus:

**'तदुपनामौ तद्वर्णित (ः) वरणि (वर्णित) ।**' Vol. I, 50

and it is rather difficult to reconstruct or understand this text. There does not seem to be unanimity among writers regarding the identity of *Tigden* and *Shanti*. The *Yabalaśāpātrama* says that, according to *Madhyama*, *Tigden* is a door-keeper of *Shiv*.—*Shivadityaśāpātrama*. The *Vicāpatyā* says the same thing and adds that it is a name of *Naṇḍivara* '**विनायकवर्णित, वर्णितौ ।**' '**अर्चकौ तदुपनामौ ।**'<sup>1</sup> In the

<sup>1</sup> The explanation of *Tigden* by *Tigden* is not the only explanation. *Alkhanov* and *Epimerkov*, in their commentaries on the *Amarakosa* (*Nigra* says, 24, 10) give *Tigden* as being so called

*Vaidhikāgasthana*, we find that according to the *Trāhagastha*, the other names of Nandikarvra are Nandi, Vāhasthāra and Tāpharasthāra, and that according to Harivamsa, the other names are Nandi and Tāphā. Kāraṇa's *Kāpādisthāna* (Bach. edn., p. 162, Sh. 113-6) gives Nandi, Vāhasthāra, Tāpharasthāra, Tāphā, Kāsthā and Kāpāsthāra as the other names of Nandikarvra. If Tāphā were a name of Nandikarvra, he would be both the time-keeper for Śiva's Tāphāra (अवसर्गः) and the possessor of the Tāphāra (अपराधः). But, according to Śaivismānanda and Bhāratamallikā, the person who is responsible for the Śāstra through which Tāphāra got its name, is a sage (Muni) named Tāphā or Tāphya. And Tāphā whom Śiva asked to teach the Tāphāra to Bhāratā may not be Nandikarvra but may be some other Gaṇa of Śiva. Kāsthalā's *Harivamsa*, which is a store-house of information for the Nitya-samādhi, mentions Nandira and Tāphā as two different persons and the commentator, Rājashāha Akṣa, adds that Tāphā is one of the Prasthāpaganas of Śiva.

after the request, Tāphā. Bhāratā (son. or Amara) says that the sage Tāphā lost Nandikarvra, a *Śrīgaganā* possessed the Śāstra which came to be called after him 'Tāphā' (शस्त्रम्), and from this Tāphā or Tāphāra derived. 'असौ गौ तपो, प्रसन्नः, सर्वशक्तिः सः (सर्वशक्तिः)'; See the *Vaidhikāgasthana* and *Vāhagastha* on Tāphāra. Śaivismānanda's *Tāhāraṇa*, p. 45, T. 5 & 6, p. 1. *वैष्णवः शिवः श्रीः . . . . . श्रीः शिवः* ; *शिवः शिवः* ; To these derivations, Śaivismānanda adds 'असौ शिवः शिवः शिवः' ; Tāphāra is so called because, being a devotional name (Uttama), earth is changed hardly or it. *Vaidhikāgastha*, *Nityagastha*, gives all these explanations. *Śaivismānanda* gives Śaivismānanda's and Śaivismānanda's explanation and adds: "असौ शिवः शिवः शिवः" ;



emotions which form the material for literature. Śaundilya relates a Rasi-legend in Ch. 3, of his *Śilpaśāstra* in which Śaundilya agrees and which legend he ascribes to Vyāsa. 'सुश्रुतिरसिं स्यात्सिद्धं वदतः' ; 'We do not yet know of a work of Vyāsa on Nāṭya. The legend given in the *Śilpaśāstra* is this: Brahman created the world as Śiva's bidding and then contemplated upon the past and new with his mind's eye the doings of Śiva. Śaundilya was appeared before Brahman at that time and taught him Nāṭya and asked him to teach the art to the Bhartṛṅga, i.e., actors. Brahman created the art of representation, drama, with a past story of Śiva called *Tripurādhī*, i.e., *Drama*. The Bhartṛṅga shaped the *Tripurādhī* and while Brahman was witnessing it, Śiva came forth from his four faces four Vyāsa with the four Rasi, Vyāghra, Vāra, Kāśha and Śikhaṭa. Concluding this story of Rasi-pāṭha, Śaundilya says

यथा प्रोक्तमस्मिन् पद्ये भवत्यर्थः ।

'The Sanskrit mentioned here is another puzzle? Śaundilya brings Nāṭya also into the story and says that Nāṭya expanded this Rasi-pāṭha to Bhartṛṅga, the sage (p. 54, Ch. III). The two *Gaṇapāṅga-pāṭha* found here are 'Śiva-Nāṭya-Bhartṛṅga-the Bhartṛṅga' and 'Nāṭya-Bhartṛṅga, the sage'. In Ch. 12, Śaundilya gives another story of how Nāṭya came to earth from heaven, where also the former *Gaṇapāṅga-pāṭha* is given. The actors, the Bhartṛṅga, are sent to this world and they write treatises on the art.

'*Pratyaṅga* may mean Śiva, himself and the world says that that the Sanskrit Bhartṛṅga is the source of this story. A Sanskrit is cited in Pīr-vādēn's *Saṅgīta-saṁgraha*, T. 8, 8 Edn, p. 42.

यथा तस्मात्सिद्धं स्यात्सिद्धं स्यात्सिद्धं ।

यथा तस्मात्सिद्धं स्यात्सिद्धं स्यात्सिद्धं ।

वाल्मीकेण्य वरतः तत्तदुक्तं तर्हि ।

केचनं तुल्मीकेनं वदुत वदितं तदुक्तं ।

एवं द्वावप्युक्तौ कोटिषु तर्हि ।

वदुति- कोलकालेनं वाल्मीकेण्य केचनं ।

Śikā. Prā. Śāstr. Edn., p. 227.

The Bhāmata wrote two works, one in 12000 Śikāras and another in 6000 Śikāras. The basis of these two is the Nigamāda, which is perhaps double the extent of the first of these two. The second work in 6000 verses is the present Nigya, others of Bhāmata and the Darśanapāśādhaka quotes it by the name, Śaśādhara, "वदुतप्रीतिप्राप्तुम्—'मन्त्रादयस्सुखं प्रीतिं एव विदुषीते' इति ।" IV. (File Bhāmata's N. S. VII, p. 63, Kāl. Edn.) Bhārataprasāda has quoted the former work as 12000 verses, the Dattaprasādhara, as his gloss on the Darśanapāśādhara. Mr. M. K. Karm quotes the Yāmadiprasādhara in the preface to his edition of the Nigamāda (Vol. I, p. 8, fn. 1), according to which the Nigamāda, which Śrīdharmāya mentions as the basis of the two Śaśādhara, is a work in 3000 Śikāras. Which of these two, the Nigamāda and the Dattaprasādhara, is the work of Śiva and which, of Bhāmata, cannot be said easily. The latter may be the Bhārataprasādhara referred to by Bhāmata. What these works say on Kāsa, we are not in a position to know.

The only work we have is the Śaśādhara of Bhāmata, the Nigamāda, which says that according to Bhāmata, Kāsa are eight. Śrīdharmāya follows this text into the form of a later controversial text, and makes Prāśādhara (Bhāmata) follow the Śikāra and accept only eight Kāsa. We can

\* File I. C. K. Mahāra, Vol. VIII, pp. 215-216, my article on Bhārataprasādhara's commentary on the Darśanapāśādhara.

conjecture solely that both the Śaṅkaraśāstra and the Bhāṣyaśāstra know only eight Rāsa.

Was there any old work which expounded more Rāsa? When did the Śāstra first make its appearance? Just after giving the above-noted view of Tānaka that Rāsa are only eight, Śrīmadharaṇya gives another account which he attributes to Viṣṇu. There seems to be, from the following verse, an old work in which Viṣṇu imparts the Nityarāsa to Śhiva.

राजनिष्ठं शान्तं वा कृता नानुविधीयता ।

नानुलोच्यते तैवा नानाद्वयवर्जिता ॥ Śā. Pra., p. 44.

The Śāstra Rāsa is accepted in this account.

रसलोच्यमिदं वा नानाद्वयं राजनिष्ठं ।

नानाद्वयवर्जितं कृतं वा द्वितीयः ॥ II, p. 45.

Who is this Viṣṇu? We already know of two sages among Śaṅkharīyans, Karmāda and Aravāṇa and we must add to them the Nityakṛtya Viṣṇu. Śrīmadharaṇya quotes Viṣṇu earlier also (pp. 34-35) regarding the date of Rāsa from Śhiva.

नानाद्वयीत्येव कर्म नानाद्वयं शान्तं वा ।

एवं वा वाच्यमिदं राजनिष्ठं वा ।

इति नानुविद्यन्मुनेः शान्तं वा नानाद्वयं ॥

This verse is, as pointed out by the editor of the Śhiva-prakāśa, found in the Nitya chapter of Bhāṣya, quoted along with four other verses, with the words— 'राजनिष्ठं वाच्यं ।'<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Thus, there are *Asaṅgāśā* and *Śaṅk* names quoted by Bhāṣya. These are called *Asaṅgāśā* names, headed down as *śāstra* and *nāṭyāśāstra* texts on Nitya section by other writers.

If we are to rely on Śhāntadāsa, we have to suppose that the Rasa chapters in Bhāṇa are based on the text in Viṅkī and others, and that this Viṅkī accepted a south Rasa, namely, the Śhānta. Why then does Bhāṇa's text not mention the Śhānta? If Bhāṇa did not approve of Śhānta being a Rasa, he must refuse it, citing Viṅkī's position. When on such controversy is seen in Bhāṇa's Nityamata, we have to conclude that Śhāntadāsa has only increased the confusion here, as on other topics also.

If we are to attach any weight to the statement of another late writer Dharmatara, author of the *Sahajamudhara*, we have to suppose that Koka is, like Viṅkī, another old writer who accepted the Śhānta Rasa. He says regarding the Śhānta of Śhānta—

“**श्रीकण्ठ उवाच वा विविदा वा कथं वा नमः स्वामीपुत्रम्**”

Text D. T. Tārakya, J. O. R., Vol. 7, p. 29.

If Koka had accepted Śhānta, Abhinava and other champions of Śhānta would have quoted him. Dharmatara's reference to Koka is unreliable. But it is also likely that a late work falsely ascribed to Koka speaks of the Śhānta and Dharmatara bases his statement on such a pseudo-Koka work.

The Nityamata of Bhāṇa still recognised only eight Rasas. Subsequently, when the Śhānta was accepted by writers, the text of the R. S. was changed and read thus as indicated by Abhinava:

The definite authorship of these *Amṛtāvalī* and *Ārya* is not known. Abhinava says while commenting on one set of such *Amṛtāvalī* Ārya, on p. 123 : “**अथ वा स्वामीपुत्रं प्रोचते**” (अथवा स्वामीपुत्रं गृह्यते इति वाच्यम्) .”

सुप्रसन्नमनसस्तथा तैद्वीत्यमनसः ।

कीदृशाद्भुतद्वन्द्वस्याश्च ननु वदसि तदाः कुरुतः ॥ N. S., VI, 16  
द्विद्वीत्यमनोवदस्य कीदृशोऽहो ननु तदा ।

सुप्रसन्नमनसस्तथा ननु वदसि तदाः कुरुतः ॥ N. S., VI, 18.

"सुप्रसन्नमनसस्तथा ननु वदसि तदाः ॥"

"तथा सुप्रसन्नमनसस्तथा ननु वदसि तदाः ॥" *Ibid.*

Udhata recognises the *Shata* as can be seen from his *Ekhyā-kārikāśraṅgāra*. He is then the first commentator on the N. S. and the first *Madhvatika* now known to have delicately begun to speak of *Rasa* as what he wanted. So, he might have made the necessary alterations in the text of the *Ekhyāśraṅga* as above shown and as pointed out by Abhinava.

Regarding the subject of *Shata* *Rasa*, the following questions arise :

(i) Did Bharata recognise it? What are the arguments of those who hold that Bharata recognises it? What is the real position of Bharata in respect of *Shata*?

(ii) Who is the first writer who introduced the *Shata* *Rasa*? What was that condition in the world of letters that led to the propagation of *Shata*?

(iii) Independent of Bharata accepting it or not, what is *Shata*? Can it be a *Rasa*? What are the arguments of the opponents of *Shata*?

(iv) What is the criticism of those who not only accept but praise the *Shata* as the greatest *Rasa*? Who are these writers? What are the literary compositions that have proved the possibility of the *Shata* *Rasa*?

(v) Who are those who, unable to find fault with *Shata*, make a compromise, deem it as *Ekhyā* and accept it as *Ekhyā* only? What are their arguments and how are they met?



(vi) Who are the writers who do not accept the Status anywhere?

(vii) What is the Scholastic of Status?

These questions will be dealt with now.

Śhaṅkara certainly mentioned only eight *Śaṅga*.<sup>1</sup> He did not give *Śhata* as the ninth *Śaṅga*. The texts on *Śhata* is certain recensions of Bhārata's *Śaṅga* which must have been interpolated by advocates of *Śhata*. Abhinava took upon the cause of *Śhata* on the basis of these *Śhata* texts available in certain recensions but he advocates its cause more vigorously and, quite independent of these *Śhata* texts in Bhārata. Abhinava even gives various arguments to show why Bhārata did not speak of it at all. Further, the advocates of *Śhata*, who point out *Nirveda* or *Dīpti* or any other *Vyākhyāna* already mentioned by Bhārata as the *Sūtrīya* of *Śhata* do so only because they feel that *Śhata*, its *Sūtrīya* etc., are not given in Bhārata; hence do they resort to the *Deśadīpāṇṭya*, *Māṅgalya-umāṅgalya* etc., to read the *Śhata* run into the text of Bhārata. How they do this is discussed in the section on the *Sūtrīya* of *Śhata* below. Again, if Ānanda who speaks of *Śhata* had known the *Śhata* texts of Bhārata and had believed in them as genuine parts of Bhārata, he would have quoted them in his advocacy of *Śhata* in *Uddipatā*.<sup>2</sup> Ānanda advocates *Śhata* on his own grounds and holds as its *Sūtrīya* neither *Nirveda* with all its taking supports, nor *Śhata* which is given as its *Sūtrīya* in the

<sup>1</sup> In the E. M. ed. of the N. H., at 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 372, 373, 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 386, 387, 388, 389, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, 455, 456, 457, 458, 459, 460, 461, 462, 463, 464, 465, 466, 467, 468, 469, 470, 471, 472, 473, 474, 475, 476, 477, 478, 479, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 486, 487, 488, 489, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494, 495, 496, 497, 498, 499, 500, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 541, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, 550, 551, 552, 553, 554, 555, 556, 557, 558, 559, 560, 561, 562, 563, 564, 565, 566, 567, 568, 569, 570, 571, 572, 573, 574, 575, 576, 577, 578, 579, 580, 581, 582, 583, 584, 585, 586, 587, 588, 589, 590, 591, 592, 593, 594, 595, 596, 597, 598, 599, 600, 601, 602, 603, 604, 605, 606, 607, 608, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614, 615, 616, 617, 618, 619, 620, 621, 622, 623, 624, 625, 626, 627, 628, 629, 630, 631, 632, 633, 634, 635, 636, 637, 638, 639, 640, 641, 642, 643, 644, 645, 646, 647, 648, 649, 650, 651, 652, 653, 654, 655, 656, 657, 658, 659, 660, 661, 662, 663, 664, 665, 666, 667, 668, 669, 670, 671, 672, 673, 674, 675, 676, 677, 678, 679, 680, 681, 682, 683, 684, 685, 686, 687, 688, 689, 690, 691, 692, 693, 694, 695, 696, 697, 698, 699, 700, 701, 702, 703, 704, 705, 706, 707, 708, 709, 710, 711, 712, 713, 714, 715, 716, 717, 718, 719, 720, 721, 722, 723, 724, 725, 726, 727, 728, 729, 730, 731, 732, 733, 734, 735, 736, 737, 738, 739, 740, 741, 742, 743, 744, 745, 746, 747, 748, 749, 750, 751, 752, 753, 754, 755, 756, 757, 758, 759, 760, 761, 762, 763, 764, 765, 766, 767, 768, 769, 770, 771, 772, 773, 774, 775, 776, 777, 778, 779, 780, 781, 782, 783, 784, 785, 786, 787, 788, 789, 790, 791, 792, 793, 794, 795, 796, 797, 798, 799, 800, 801, 802, 803, 804, 805, 806, 807, 808, 809, 810, 811, 812, 813, 814, 815, 816, 817, 818, 819, 820, 821, 822, 823, 824, 825, 826, 827, 828, 829, 830, 831, 832, 833, 834, 835, 836, 837, 838, 839, 840, 841, 842, 843, 844, 845, 846, 847, 848, 849, 850, 851, 852, 853, 854, 855, 856, 857, 858, 859, 860, 861, 862, 863, 864, 865, 866, 867, 868, 869, 870, 871, 872, 873, 874, 875, 876, 877, 878, 879, 880, 881, 882, 883, 884, 885, 886, 887, 888, 889, 890, 891, 892, 893, 894, 895, 896, 897, 898, 899, 900, 901, 902, 903, 904, 905, 906, 907, 908, 909, 910, 911, 912, 913, 914, 915, 916, 917, 918, 919, 920, 921, 922, 923, 924, 925, 926, 927, 928, 929, 930, 931, 932, 933, 934, 935, 936, 937, 938, 939, 940, 941, 942, 943, 944, 945, 946, 947, 948, 949, 950, 951, 952, 953, 954, 955, 956, 957, 958, 959, 960, 961, 962, 963, 964, 965, 966, 967, 968, 969, 970, 971, 972, 973, 974, 975, 976, 977, 978, 979, 980, 981, 982, 983, 984, 985, 986, 987, 988, 989, 990, 991, 992, 993, 994, 995, 996, 997, 998, 999, 1000.

interpolated Śhanta text in Bhāṭṭa; Ananda holds as the Śhākyas 'that happiness which is the annihilation of all desires'—*सुखमनुभूतम्*.

— *दृष्ट्वा हि स्वप्नं न ह्यन्यं लोकोद्गमिष्यतीति विदित्वा, तत्रैव सुखम्*.' *Ābhāsana, Locana*.

All the writers who relate Śhanta are of opinion that Bhāṭṭa's text does not know the Śhanta rasa. Further, Bhāṭṭa gives *Laga*, *Svara*, *Gana*, *Alambika*, *Vṛtta*, *Vṛtta* etc., for the eight Rāsa only in the several sections of his work; Śhanta is not mentioned here anywhere. This is part of the objection raised against Śhanta by its critics. They say, Bhāṭṭa has related *rasas* and *Rāsa* and has mentioned the *Jhāyāga* suggestion of the several Rāsa but does not mention the Śhanta here. (Pāṭi N. P. XXII, Ślo. 2-4.) We find in the *Ābhāsavāhikā*:

— *लोकोद्गमः प्राप्तो न ह्यन्यं सुखं सुखिना प्राप्तवतीति विदित्वा-  
सुखे । तत्र आनन्दमधिनिर्वाणमस्य आनन्दमिति वस्तुमस्य ।"*

*Caṣk. Edn., I, p. 159*

*Ābhāsana* first argues for Śhanta not on the basis of Bhāṭṭa's mention of it, but on the basis of his silence on the subject which *Ābhāsana* makes out as more important. This will be explained later. Suffice to point out here that express mention of Śhanta is not found in Bhāṭṭa.

If this is accepted, we can trace the way by which Śhanta slowly came to be accepted as a Rāsa. We can even explore the possibilities of finding some aspects of Śhanta in Bhāṭṭa's accepted text. Bhāṭṭa, it must be borne in mind, handles the whole world and analyses human psychology to a great extent and it will be a wonder if he were to be entirely

insistent of that part of human activity which is the sphere of the *Shata-rasa*. The absence of *Shata* in theory does not, however, mean the absence of poetry or drama with the quantitative motif. To suppose so would be as foolish as to think that before *Rasadharmas* was formulated as the code of poetry, no great poetry existed. An *Rasadharmas* points out, the *Rasa* of the great epic, the *Mahābhārata*, is *Shata*. The *Raj*, the fourth *Purāṇikā* or *Māhā*, the third and the fourth *Aranyakas* of the *Vāgveda* and the *Sākyatā*—these were already parts and noble parts of *Rāgya* such as the *Tagh-rasas* and *Nāgya* such as the *Shikharā*. *Shanta*, himself a sage, gave the *Nāgya* to an assemblage of sages. *Shanta*, therefore, could hardly have lost sight of the *Raj*, the forests, *Tapas*, etc. As a matter of fact, *Shanta* does mention aspects of this *Shata-rasa* and its attendant conditions.

An emotion is recognised as *Rasa* if it is a sufficiently permanent major contact of man, if it is capable of being developed and delinquent to its climax with its attendant and accessory feelings and if there are men of that temperament to feel imaginative emotional sympathy at the presentation of that *Rasa*. That are *Syāgira* and the other seven *Rasa*. So, if *Shanta* says that drama is of a varied nature is accordance with the varied nature of the world on the one hand and of the spectators on the other, if he says that one drama predominantly develops one *Rasa* whose appeal is only to those whose hearts are attuned to it and if he says that a certain drama may have its thrust at persons in *Shanta*, it certainly means that *Shanta* has headed, though unconsciously, on the *Shata-rasa*. *Shanta* says and these are really genuine parts of the text:

कविर्लोकं कविर्दुःखं कविर्लोकं कविर्दुःखः । १, १०४ ।  
 दुःखलोकं कविर्लोकं कविर्दुःखं ।

। विभक्तिवत्तमं वदते मन्त्रमेतद्विभक्तिः ॥ १, 115.

वदन्तीति च विभक्तिं वदन्तं वृत्तवदन्तीत्यम् ॥ १, 121.

The first given passage is referred to by Abhinava, who is concerned with the discussion on the advisability of drama as a *Rasa* and by drawing attention to this 115—*विभक्तिवत्तमं*, Abhinava asks whether Bharata did not recognise the quantitative element also as part of dramatic presentation :

“ वदन्तीति वदन्ति वृत्तिवत्तमविवक्षितं एव ‘विभक्तिवत्तमं’ इत्यति-  
वदन्ति । ” Abhinava, Locana, p. 177.

Another instance of Bharata's awareness of the element of drama is pointed out by Abhinava. It is similar to the second passage extracted above. It refers to such spectators as are bereft of life's passions—*Vibhaktas*—to whom only dramas of a nature in harmony with those and dramas depicting the *Malayaprasaitha* can have any appeal. While pointing out in Ch. XXVII that the very life of drama is its fusion with the audience and that certain hearts can respond only to certain themes, Bharata says :

वृत्तवत्तमं वदन्तः वदन्ते विभक्तिः वदन्तीति ।

वदन्तीति वदन्ति वृत्तिवत्तमं विभक्तिः ॥

XXVII, 31, Kail. Edn.

Says Abhinava in regard to this passage :

“ वृत्तवत्तमविवक्षितं वदन्तिवत्तमविवक्षितविवक्षितविवक्षितं वदन्ति,  
वदन्तीति ‘वदन्ते वदन्ति विभक्तिः’ इति ” । Gail. Edn., I, p. 343.

Further, Bharata speaks of a *Rasa* for each *Prasaita* in Ch. XXIV and mentions here the variety called *Malayaprasaitha*. What does this mean ?

। कर्णलोर्जनाय च योऽनुयायाम रमिषः ।

योऽनुयायः संयोगे च, वाचः च ह्यनुयायः ॥ XXIV, 11.

The *Shata* is only the *Rasa* of *Madha* *Kina*. Compare the *Mahābhārata*, *Arva. parva*, Ch. XIII, 16, where *Kina* says of himself:

१ यो वां वदामि ह्यनु योऽनुयायाम रमिषः ।

अथ योऽनुयायिनाम अनुयायि च ह्यनुयायि च ॥

Again, what does *Dharma* mean by giving great scope for *Dharma* as an important theme handled in drama, by saying that drama is *Dharmayā*, by mentioning *Dharma* as the purpose of some dramas, *धर्मिषु धर्मैः*, by speaking of *Dharma* *Spigha* and by pointing out that the old, the learned and the experienced respond to such dramas as are based on *Dharma*-*Śhikṣapāṭha* which comes under the *Vaidikśāstrīya* of the *Shata*?

यस्योपायपुराणेषु वृत्तावस्थितिः शिवः । XXVII, 11.

While describing *Narada*<sup>1</sup>, Bhāsa speaks of one kind of it that is born of *Tatvavijñāna*, giving the names of *Gītā*, he speaks of *Tatvavijñāna*, defining *Śhikṣā*<sup>2</sup>, Bhāsa gives *Vijñāna*, *Śhikṣā*, *Śhikṣakāra* and *Śhikṣakāra* as some of its *Vidhāna* and these pertain to *Shata*; *Māta* is given as born of *Nishikṣāntarvāntara*. If the *śhikṣāntarvāntara* is not recognized even in some aspect by him, Bhāsa cannot say of *Narada* that it is *Truṣṭyāntarvāntara*, that there is no *Jñāna* which is not

<sup>1</sup> Some hold that *Narada* is the *Śhikṣā* of *Shata*.

<sup>2</sup> *Shikṣā* holds that *Shikṣā* is the *Śhikṣā* of *Shata* in *U. S. K. A. V. 15* and also pp. 114-5.

part of drama and no *Vidya* which does not come within it :

॥ ३१ ॥ ३११॥ etc. I, 117.

The instance above shows just only the recognition of *Varna* as an element and they do not mean Bharata's acceptance of the *Varna* as a *Rasa*. To be precise, *Varna* is not mentioned as one of the forty-eight *Rāsvas*. Bharata did not have before him any specimen of drama written only for *Mohya* and *Vidya*. It may be that there cannot also be dramas having only *Rasayuktas*, *Adbhutas*, etc., as their *Rasa*. These can appear only as *Alpa* or *Sukala* *rāsva*. But the reason for the acceptance of *Rasayuktas*, *Adbhutas*, *Rūpāras*, etc., as *Rāsva* is that humanity is more liable to these than to *Varna*, *Varṇa* allotted to which must necessarily be very small in number. *Varna* is almost impossible. For, the opponents of *Vāta* (e.g., *Ignorance*, *Avyāk*, producing *Rāga* and *Dveṣa* which result in a network of psychology covered by the eight *Sādhya*, in whom no man ever once he begins his migration as *Sanātana* and practically speaking, this *Avyāk* cannot be rooted out. That is, *Rāsva* which is their chance cannot be obtained. The *Avyāk* in the *Darmapada* says :

“*यद्ये न कल्पयन्तावन्तं कीदृशं । अद्विजानलमप्यन-  
राज्येनोपपन्नमप्यनराज्यं ।*” p. 117.

This, however, is not wholly true for there is not any lack of persons who take to *Varna* and strive to root out *Rāga* and *Dveṣa*. But this criticism against *Vāta* is pertinent to some extent in regard to drama generally which is for pleasure and which deals with worldly things. Drama arose as an entertainment—*अनन्तराज्यमपि तदा तदा ॥ ३१ ॥ ३११॥* Bharata also says that *Mīṭya* is *Virodhajanya*. Bhāratya also says that

though the *Mahākāvya* depicts all the four *Purusharthas*, it shall predominantly meditate only *Artha*.

अथशुभकामाभिलाषाशुद्धीयः च ॥

चतुर्लोकनिर्गमेऽपि चतुर्लोकलोकादयः ॥ K. A., I, 28-29.

Abhinava draws our attention in this connection to Bharata's definition of *Nipata* which emphasises the fact that it shall depict chiefly worldly prosperity, gaiety, etc. From this point of view, Abhinava even says that *Shata* is after all only *Apamāna*, not the leading motif.

“अथ एव चतुर्लोकः स्वाभिलेखकचतुर्लोकः । तेष्वन्यत्रैव  
विशेषज्ञानयोगेऽपि तेष्वन्यत्रैवचतुर्लोकः चतुर्लोकः । तेष्वन्यत्रैवचतुर्लोकः  
चतुर्लोकः चतुर्लोकः ‘चतुर्लोकचतुर्लोकः’ ॥ ७८. ७९, XX, ११५’ इति ।  
तस्मै च चतुर्लोकचतुर्लोकचतुर्लोकचतुर्लोकः तस्मै चतुर्लोकचतुर्लोकचतुर्लोकचतुर्लोकः  
चतुर्लोकचतुर्लोकचतुर्लोकचतुर्लोकः चतुर्लोकचतुर्लोकचतुर्लोकचतुर्लोकः । चतुर्लोक चतुर्लोक  
चतुर्लोकः ।” *Cash. Edn.*, I, p. 224.

Therefore it is that the *Caṇḍikāśāstra*, the earlier commentator on the *Dharm. Ś.*, says that the *Shata* spoken of by *Ānanda* is certainly admissible as a *Rasa*, but that it can appear only as an *Alpa* *rasa* in the *Pramāṇika* *Āṅga* and never as the chief *Rasa* *Āṅga* in the *Āśāśāstra* *Āṅga*. Evidently, the *Caṇḍikāśāstra* also held the view that *Vīra* and *Vyāghra* are the *Rasas* in the *Nīṭyaśāstra* in accordance with the ruling in the statement of *Valmiki* *Samudra* and the combined *Āśāśāstra*, and that the *Shata* *rasa* is as a subsidiary idea to give a new variety of *Vīra* called *Shyāma*. Abhinava, however, rejects this view of the *Caṇḍikāśāstra* in his *Locana*.



“वाचिस्पतिस्तेन तु वाचो रसो (रसो न) निराकृत इति  
वर्तितवत्तः । तन्नेष्टुमपिनि वर्तितवितम् ।” *Locana*, p. 175.

But the above given account from the *Abh.* still seems to grant what Abhinava has criticised in his own *Locana*. He seems to grant that it is literature of Trivarga-ism that is of wide appeal in the world. Early dramatic literature dealt with Trivarga and the eight Rāsa only.

But soon drama was to be made the noble vehicle of spiritual and religious instruction to the masses. Leaving the Buddhist, Mahābhārata, we find Aranyakas's *Buddhacarita* and Saundaryananda's starting the religious Kāvya, and his *Śrīrāmapadaśatka* and the allegorical dramatic fragment discovered by Dr. Loken, the religious drama. The Buddhist and Jain poets and dramatists might have been responsible for the introduction of philosophical poems<sup>1</sup> and plays, for

<sup>1</sup> Cf. The *Saundaryananda*, has two verses at the end in which Aranyakas says that he wrote a *Mahābhārata* for Upaśānta and Moha, mixing a Trivarga-ism with Madhva.

रसोऽयं सुखमयश्चैव न रसो दीर्घकालं गतः  
रसोऽयं सुखमयश्चैव न रसो दीर्घकालं गतः ।  
रसोऽयं सुखमयश्चैव न रसो दीर्घकालं गतः  
रसोऽयं सुखमयश्चैव न रसो दीर्घकालं गतः ।

“रसमयश्चैव न रसो दीर्घकालं गतः ।”

(i) The Jain work, the *Varaṇaśikharastotra*, is a handbook of knowledge of miscellaneous things arranged in sets of one, two, six. (Peterson's *Report* III, Calcutta, 1916. II, Verse 742-4. *Asiatic Soc. Bengal* 4703 A). Of uncertain date, this work mentions Trivarga in the 34 *Bhāṣya* given by it. Albeit its Jain authorship, it gives only Eight Rāsa,—*asā* ४४. (Peterson III, p. 304a).

(ii) There is a Jain work named *Akhyānashikharastotra* by Munivandana (end of the 14th and early part of the 15th cent.

making *Stuva* the Jany name of the *Nilakanta* songs. We know that there were Buddhist writers on Nigya like *Śāhaka*, who, as evidence of his taste in the *Abhinavabhāratī* shows, had his own differences from *Bhāsa*. Further, the Jain *Amargadhyāya* stotra, placed in the 5th century, mentions some *Rama*, adding the *Paṇḍitarāma* to the eight old *Rama* (see below). Dr. S. K. De says in his *Sri. Poetics* (Vol. I, p. 35 f.n.): "The Jain *Amargadhyāya* Stotra (ed. H. S. P. 1915, Vol. 114-5, also quoted in *Waher* 1, 2, pp. 731-2) which, Winternitz thinks, was probably put together by the middle of the 5th century, mentions some *Rama*, which, however, have hardly any reference (?) to poetic or dramatic *Rama*, but the enumeration is interesting from the inclusion of *Paṇḍita* (not mentioned by *Bhāsa*) apparently from religious motives." It is not known why Dr. De considers these some *Rama* mentioned in the *Amargadhyāya* stotra as having hardly any reference to poetic or dramatic *Rama*. They are definitely mentioned in the work as 'ॐ राम राम ॐ', the most *Rama* of *Kṛtya* (see below).

The *Nigāṇḍaka*, the first and only specimen to which the early advocates of *Stuva* cling, is a Buddhist story. *Śāhaka* had leanings towards Buddhism and if this long *Śāhaka* is the same as the *Vaṭṭakāṇḍa* of the *Paṇḍitarāma* quoted in the *Abhinavabhāratī* (which, however, is yet quite improved), it is likely that his *Nigya* *Vaṭṭika*, which must have made

A. D. 1, which is otherwise called *Paṇḍitarāma* (Ed. Hinayana, 1904, with extracts from *Dharmapala*'s edition). The work says in the *Pratibhāṭika* that *Stuva* is proposed to be treated in the work and in the next verse which is titled, 'Nigāṇḍaka-sūtrānta', the author declares the *Stuva* as *Amargadhyāya*. The commentary describes the *Stuva* as "Śāhaka (Śāhakaśāhaka) Śāhaka-rāga" and "Amargadhyāya". Compare also the names of some other Jain works *Paṇḍitarāma* and *Paṇḍitarāma* of *Viṣṇu* (see below) and the *Paṇḍitarāma* of *Viṣṇu* (see below).

सत्यस्युक्त-पुनर्विपरीत, introduced the *Śhānta* as a *Rasa*. It seems very likely that it is the appearance of the *Kāligāthā* in the world of drama that created a stir and set the discussion on *Śhānta* on its feet in works on *Rāga* and *Alambika*.

What are the objections raised by the critics of *Śhānta* against accepting it as a *Rasa*? The first objection is that Bharata did not speak of it. This is really no serious objection. The greater objection is that pertaining to the real nature of *Śhānta* itself. *Śhānta*, its critics say, is the total absence of all feelings and activities. Such a state of inaction cannot be presented on the stage.

“कालाचक्रवर्तीः हि वस्तुना . . . कवीनामवस्थानि-  
जम् । न हि वेदाङ्गनामः कवीनाम् ।” *Abh. Dhā.*, p. 334

This argument proceeds on a wrong conception. The state of absolute cessation of action is only the *climax*, the *Paryasta-Bhāva*, and this certainly cannot be shown. But the *Paryasta-Bhāva* of all other *Rāsa*s also end on the same beat. *Śhānta* is not denied as a *Rasa* because *Samprapāṇa* is said to be shown on the stage. So also *mādhya* and *Raudra*. So, the acceptance of *Śhānta* does not mean the attempt to present the impossible cessation of action but means only the portrayal of an ardent spirit in search of Truth and tranquillity. The manifold effects of the Yousādan, his trials, his various over passions—these can be portrayed with great interest. Even one who has attained Truth can be shown and there will be no lack of action in him. A *Siddha* like Jambūn will be doing *Lakṣmīgāthā*. The *GH* says:

प्रीतिरित्येतत् प्रसङ्गोऽप्युक्तः । III, 21.

The *GH* speaks of many a thing which a *Siddha* does.

Similar to the above named objection is the explanation which another writer offers for the omission of the *Śhānta*. The *Śaṅkarapādaśāstrī*, ascribed to Śaṅkara, has three comments to speak of the Rāsa. In two verses 41 and 50, the hymn expressly mentions 'the nine Rāsa', "nava rasā", in verse 41 with reference to Nitya and in verse 50 with reference to Kīrtya. But in verse 34, the hymn refers only to eight Rāsa which are described there as being supported by the look of the Goddess. In the commentary on this verse, the *Śhāstrī*, Lalla Lakṣmīdhara offers an explanation for the omission of the *Śhānta* here. He says that according to Bhārata's school, Rāsa are only eight, for Rāsa means a certain modification or state of the Citta and *Śhānta* being really the absence of any state or modification, some do not consider it a Rāsa.

"विनिवृत्त्यन्तः एव सा इति यो सा वदन्ती । 'सामान्यं विनिवृत्त्यन्तं न सायं वेदि सत्यं' इति सामान्यं यथालम्बाय्  
यद्यपि साः सङ्ख्येयाः ।" Pg. 154-5, Mysore Edn.

It is clear from Lakṣmīdhara's remarks here and on the two verses mentioning the nine Rāsa that personally he would accept the *Śhānta*. But any definite and detailed idea of Lakṣmīdhara's views on the *Śhānta* could be had only when we receive his *Sāhitya* work, the Lakṣmīdhara, mentioned by him among his works in the colophon at the end of his commentary on the *Śaṅkarapādaśāstrī*.

That Bhārata has not given the *Vibhāvāsa*, *Anubhāvāsa* and *Vyabhidhāvāsa* of *Śhānta*, as also its appropriate *Yuktā*, musical *Jatā*, etc. is another trifling objection. There can be easily made out. Abhinava gives them. The interpolated *Śhānta* text in Bhārata gives the *Vibhāvāsa*, etc. of *Śhānta*. The *Sāhitya* of *Śhānta* is elaborately discussed in a special section.

below. Its Vāśīdhas are given in the text as Tattvāgama, Vāśāgga, Aṅgavāśīdha, etc. Its Anāśīdhas are Yama, Vyoma, the practice of virtues, penance, etc. Almost all Bhāvas can be its Vyākhyānāntas. Abhinava adds the Vāśīdhas, *सुखं, शान्तिः*, the good done in the past births, God's grace, study of philosophy, etc. Abhinava further remarks that in Śānta one can see and enjoy the Anāśīdhas, viz., the slow disappearance of Kāma, Rāga, etc. and other evils and thus through the whole world of Bhāvas becomes Vyākhyānānta for the Śānta, such Bhāvas like Sarvaśa and Jāgataśa for worldly objects, Dhyā, Māt, Uśānta of the type as Dhyānta, Kāśa for God in the form of Bhāva and Vyākhyānta will stand out prominently as more intimate accessories, *अभ्युपगम्यः* *अङ्गः*<sup>1</sup>. The text of the Abhinavāśīdhas dealing on these is added in a further section of this paper.

The next objection against Śānta is the impossibility of Śānta becoming a general feature of humanity as the same measure and to the same extent as Kāśa, etc., for the whole world is wrapt in Aśānta and is eternally slave to Rāga and Dveṣa. We know of the right Śāntya only, as distinctive as man. Dhyā, Māt, etc. are given as Vyākhyānāntas in Śānta but we do not know of Dhyā or Māt helping Śānta. All the Dhyā and Māt known to us is mingled with Rāga and Dveṣa and other mundane attachments.

शान्त्यान्तः सुखं शान्तिः यमः शान्तिः ॥

Abh. Bhā., p. 134.

<sup>1</sup> In ch. 4 (p. 121 f.) Abhinavāśa again treats of Śānta, in a clearer manner. First he proves it as the Kāśa which gives Mātsa and gives its Vāśīdhas, etc. Then he says that it has not got Vāśīdhas, etc. to a full extent, as Vāśāgga. Subsequently that despite its *अशान्त्यन्ता*, it is a Pralaya because of its relation with the fourth Pariphalpa of Mātsa.

Not in the portrayal of non-action any good has Vyasa put. The mere presentation of non-action does not educate anybody in the means to attain knowledge of Truth.

‘य य वृद्धिदिवसस्योत्तमं सत्यज्ञोत्तमं सुप्रसन्नं हितम् ।

*Shat.*, p. 134

The spiritual element is not a dominant factor in man's life. If a poet develops it, it will become strange and unbelievable that there are really such impossible men who have enjoyed the pleasures of the world, women, position, wealth, etc. The general mass of the audience is made of ordinary men who will hardly respond to such a drama or have any *Catharsis* in it. The drama on the *Darshayaka* says :

‘यद्ये तु वस्तुतस्तस्य यद्यर्थं यथैव हि । ययवृद्धिदिवसस्योत्तमं सत्यज्ञोत्तमं सुप्रसन्नं हितम् ।’ *Dr. R. A.*, p. 137.

‘य य वृद्धिदिवसस्योत्तमं सत्यज्ञोत्तमं सुप्रसन्नं हितम् ।’

*Shat.*, p. 134.

All these objections are raised and answered by Kamadeva's drama.

‘यद्यि यय वृद्धिदिवसस्योत्तमं सत्यज्ञोत्तमं सुप्रसन्नं हितम् । ययवृद्धिदिवसस्योत्तमं सत्यज्ञोत्तमं सुप्रसन्नं हितम् ।’ *Dr. R. A.*, p. 137.

That the larger part of humanity is wallowing in mundane pleasures does not disprove the existence of saints and seers. There are persons of spiritualist bent and to them the *Śāstra* play is bound to appeal. To them, the *Syngara* and *Vin* plays will have little appeal. Surely, on that ground, *Syngara* and *Vin* are not dismissed from the field of *Kamas*.

“यत्तु सा कृत्स्नसंसारमहाप्रलयमयीय रीतमया । न एवमत्र  
 कालीति । ननु कालेन परोक्षम् । ननु कालेनो, कालेन साक्षात्  
 न कालि । तर्हि बीजावयवां वृक्षादी न काले इति कीदृशि साक्षात्प-  
 र्यायिनि लब्ध—इति वक्ष्येति ।” *Locana*, p. 177.

The argument of the responsibility of non-action being shown has already been refuted.

An extension of the argument that the State is not reliable is the argument that drama which is essentially for entertainment and Treasury-expansion must ignore Rādhā, Vīṭha, etc. So have all dramas done. There are no plays which have developed Śīta. The *Māyavāda*, which some hold as a Śīta play, is plainly not so. For the end here is not Mokṣa, but the attaining of lordship over the *Vidyādhama*, and all through, the love-theme runs and that is the first thing antagonistic to Śīta. *Thaṣṭha Vā* and *Dyagha*, the latter as *Dyāgha*, stand out prominently in the *Māyavāda*.

“यत्तु वैदिकवाक्यमन्वयी कृत्स्न सप्तविन्दुसन्निभम्, यत्तु  
 कलकलदुग्धमेव भासकमदुग्धेन विभासाकलमङ्गितमप्यत्र विदुम् ।  
 न वेदानुकार्येण्यवयवमयी विमलदुग्धमालाप्रदुग्धमयी । यतो यदा-  
 योनिप्रदुग्धम् सप्तविन्दुम् । तमेव वृक्षात्तम् यज्ञमेव पञ्चमङ्गितमेव  
 कालेन पश्चिमेनान् इतिमेव न तमेव कर्तव्यमिति परोक्षाननुकूलम्  
 विचिन्त्योऽप्यन्वयिकमेव यत्तु केनैत इति व्यवेक्ष्यमेव यत्तु ।”

D. E. Arnold, p. 117.

All the arguments given above cannot improve the possi-  
 bility of Śīta as a Rām capable of relief by spectators. It  
 is bound to be unconvincing; all the same, it is as true as the  
 latest experience and the higher life of the mystic which is

not so common with the life of ordinary worldly men. If drama is not only a part of the world but a glorious part of it also, it should also be so of the drama... Abhinavarya says that *Ramayan*, poetry and drama, cannot restrict themselves to the *Tiranga* only but must get ennobled by embracing the fourth and the greatest *Parangatha* also, *Shloka*. The attitude to *Shloka* in *Rama* and *Shama*, is the basis of the drama which depicts the endeavour to attain that.

“अथैषा—अथ इह तस्मात् सर्वविहितम्, एवं वेदोऽपि  
 पुनर्वर्त्तते, तस्मैव सत्योद्दिष्टादिषु न वाच्यमेव तस्मात्ते बहुधाप्यत्र  
 इति सुचरितम् । अथ न वाच्येति बहुविधविहितपक्षोऽप्यभि-  
 वादकः । अस्मिन्नाचार्येण व्यासस्योक्त्याप्यत्रोक्तं तस्मिन्नाचार्य-  
 सेनस्यैव वाच्यमित्याहुः इति तत्त्वं दृष्ट्वादिह वाच्ये, अथ वेदवि-  
 त्वात्तद्व्याख्यायितव्यं निवर्त्तते, तस्मैव तस्मैव इति  
 वक्तव्यम् ।” *Atth. Bhāṣ. 3. Gāth. Bhāṣ. p. 154.*

To say that it is impossible to accommodate Kings and Dregs is to insult humanity, its heritage of philosophy and the long chain of its spiritual leaders. Surely there are men of their kind which can respond to a State drama. That leaders are not able to get through it cannot disprove it. It will be a pity if literature, and drama in particular, cannot rise beyond the level of mere entertainment and gusto. It has been accepted that all cannot respond to all Rases. Surely Bhaskara will not raise sympathy as a heroic agent. Bhaskara himself gives the respective characters—Padmika—who respond to the different Rases. Kings and Jangals are Hiss-padika Bhikaru; Uthara Bhaskara do not have Chhambardika on using them. If Vira delight in Spatika, Vira's delight is Hiss.





at Kovidrigata, not to mention other worldly ventures, is very well brought out by the epic. By the manifestation of even the name of Kṛpā and by postulating Kṛpā as the central personality, as the pivot of the plot, by calling the epic Nāṭyapaṭhā, says Vyāsa has made his message plain. The genius of Vyāsa would not have attempted at anything lower than this.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>2</sup> The following ideas and passages in the epic may be considered in this connection:

(a) In the first Aśvayajña of the Śāntiparvan, the epic relates Dharma and Kṛpā, its protagonist and antagonist, and says that it shall speak of the eternal Dharma. If a work is a Dharmashāstra or Vidyaparvāṇa, it is a Nāṭya Śāstra in Dharma.

नतं नतं नतं नतं नतं नतं ।

नतं नतं नतं नतं नतं नतं, ॥ ११. १.

(b) In Fl. 10 of the same ch. Śaun. says that the Dharma is the story of the Lord Himself—*नतं नतं नतं नतं नतं नतं* ।

(c) While giving the essential ideas of the great epic, it is said that the epic depicts the greatness of the Lord—*नतं नतं नतं नतं नतं नतं* . . . *नतं नतं नतं* ।

नतं नतं नतं नतं नतं नतं ।

नतं नतं नतं नतं नतं नतं ।

(d) In Śān. 104-2 in which the epic is described as a tree, it is said in Fl. 105 that the great fruit of this tree is the Dharmapāra—*नतं नतं नतं* .

(e) At the end of the Śāntiparvan, Dharmarajata, who is grieved at the loss of his son is consoled by Nāṭya who has a kṛpā on Kila, the all-devoting Kila, on hearing which the old king got Dharma.

नतं नतं नतं नतं नतं नतं ।

नतं नतं नतं नतं नतं नतं ।

Immediately after this, the Dharmā is described as Upaniṣat :

नतं नतं नतं नतं नतं नतं ।

(f) In Fl. 201, the Dharmā is likened to the Aranyak among the Vedas.

(g) In Fl. 10-12, in the Dharmapāraśāstra it is said that the work with the Dharmā, even as Vidyā is sought by those

If one finds relief and importance in the subsidiary themes of marriage, death, suffering, light, it does not prevent another reader of nobler instincts and mystic disposition seeing through who desires liberation; and that it is like *Ālmas* among things we most realize.

विश्वरूपमयविभवविभक्तम् ।

सर्वत्र ये सर्वविभवानि सर्वत्र न

सर्वत्र विभक्तम् . . . अ. सर्वविभवम्, a 15, 16

(4) At the end of the *Parasamuhaparyant* and at the end of the *Mahāprasthāna*, *Īśvara*, is sung of as the supreme good, not rather *Ālma* or *Ākasa*. (I, v, 292, and XVIII, v, 75-7.)

(5) *Ālma*, *ak*, *Āl*

सर्वत्र ये सर्वविभवानि सर्वत्र न

सर्वत्र विभक्तम् सर्वत्र विभक्तम् सर्वत्र न

सर्वत्र विभक्तम् सर्वत्र विभक्तम् सर्वत्र न

सर्वत्र विभक्तम् सर्वत्र विभक्तम् सर्वत्र न

सर्वत्र विभक्तम् सर्वत्र विभक्तम् सर्वत्र न

सर्वत्र विभक्तम् सर्वत्र विभक्तम् सर्वत्र न

(6) Both in the beginning and end, all-embracing *Īśa* is sung of. (I, v, 223-225 and XVI, iv, 34-35.) This is for *Vaṇṭiga*.

(7) The triumph of Time, the vanity of earthly glories and the inevitable *Morada* are given in a masterly manner when the great archer, *Arjuna*, dead and dead, but could not see his bow when before his very eyes the *Yātara* women were killed by the *Imaya* and *Ālmas*.

सर्वत्र ये सर्वविभवानि सर्वत्र न

सर्वत्र ये सर्वविभवानि सर्वत्र न

सर्वत्र ये सर्वविभवानि सर्वत्र न

सर्वत्र ये सर्वविभवानि सर्वत्र न

सर्वत्र ये सर्वविभवानि सर्वत्र न

In the course of his introductory verses or his commentary on the *Gītā*, *Acharyasaputra* says that the chief fruit of the sight of

them, and deducing the greatness of the Lord, of Dharma, of Brahma and of Vishnu. To write in such a perfect manner as to give Virāṭi for the readers in the Śaṅkara-māta and Śaṅkara-theśvara also is not only not incompatible but is in perfect harmony with the chief aim and chief idea. *Pañc Dīpa*. A. Vol. IV, p. 219. Also Abhinava in his *Abh. Bhā.*—

‘एतं श्रीगुरुनि निबन्धितम्, लघुनीतिव्याप्यं, यत्तु त्वमत्र  
दीर्घं विप्रादां पाठयतः ।’ Gaṇṭh. I, p. 359.<sup>1</sup>

Next in importance to the Mahābhārata are the two Śhāstra nam. poems of Aravindhara, the *Śhāntiśāstra* and the

*Śhānti* or *Śhānti*, and that *Śhānti*, etc., are for its develop-  
ment.

‘शान्तिं गुरुं गुरुं गुरुं  
एतं शान्तिशिक्षणं यत्तु ।  
शान्तिं गुरुं गुरुं गुरुं  
यत्तु त्वमत्र दीर्घं, यत्तु, ३

Abhinava's pupil, Kṛṣṇacharya, holds Śhānti as the teaching of the 11 Śhānti. He says at the end of his *Śhāntiśāstra*—

‘शान्तिशिक्षणं यत्तु त्वमत्र दीर्घं  
यत्तु, यत्तु शान्तिशिक्षणं यत्तु दीर्घं, ३  
दीर्घं यत्तु शान्तिशिक्षणं यत्तु, यत्तु त्वमत्र  
यत्तु दीर्घं, यत्तु गुरुं गुरुं यत्तु दीर्घं, ३

<sup>1</sup> The author of the *Śhāntiśāstra*, in his criticism of the *Śhānti*, says that in the *Great Epic*, ‘*Śhānti* had described “*Śhānti*” in *Śhānti*’ as well as in *Śhānti*, that was what is by nature attached to it, but attached to *Śhānti* itself for the *Śhānti*.

‘शान्तिं शान्तिशिक्षणम्  
यत्तु शान्तिशिक्षणम् ।  
यत्तु शान्तिं यत्तु, यत्तु  
यत्तु शान्तिं यत्तु शान्तिं यत्तु, ३

1, 5, 13.



10. *Maṇḍitā* on five-Rāga relations. Sans., pp. 70, 187. Intro. p. xxv. Calcutta, Bibliotheca Indica Catalogue, I, 449a. [Same as *And* I, p. 457a.—*Maṇḍitā*, *Yellā*, *Paris D*, 213, III.]

11. *Maṇḍitā*, *Jain Jain Granthāvalī*, p. 131.

12. *Meghasthānamāvalī* by Meghasthā. This is a stanza to the author's *Guru*, line No. 5.

13. *Śāntā* by Cākrasāraṅgast; not a regular *Dharmā*.

14. *Maṇḍitā* by Indira; according to *Paṇḍita*. *Br. Ma. Pr. Bib. Cat.* 1904-05, 314.

15. *Sādhana* of *Amalānātha*. (Sansk., 1423) (*Br. Ma. Pr. Cat.* 1895). Here, "a *Tāra* is the lover, a *Sodha* is the *Itā* and *Vajrā* is the beloved."

16. *Tāra* New Cat. 3792. *Mānāvalī* by *Jagadīśa*. "This is an allegorical *Kīra* explaining the greatness of *Yellā*."

17. *Tāra* New Cat. 3716. *Vijānāvalī* by *Nāth*. A *Kīra* on the life of *Paṇḍita*, a great devotee.

18. *Myra* I, p. 246. *Gitāvalī* (2 MS.) by *Abhinava*. *Chāndīpāṇḍitā*. This work is called *Chāndīpāṇḍitā* *Alapā* in a MS. in the *Jain Math* at *Stavara* *Belgaṇa*. This appears to be a *Jain* *Prāsa* *Rasa* imitation of the *Gitāvalī* of *Jagadīśa*.

Among *Gurus*, *Aravind*'s seems to be the earliest to have *Śrī* as their dominant *Rasa*. The *Śrīpāṇḍitā* deals with the conversion of the hero to the *Paṇḍita* faith and another of his dramatic fragments discovered by Dr. Leiders shows an allegorical spiritual drama. Long after the time of *Amalā*, and about the time of *Abhinava*, *Kṛṣṇa* (c. 1550) wrote his *Abhinava* allegory, the

*Prabodhanandodaya*,<sup>1</sup> which inaugurated a regular category of philosophical and allegorical plays. The following plays of this class were produced in different parts of the country, to propagate the several schools of philosophical and religious thought:

1. *Kabarkaparikaya*. Jan. Yachayathil. in. A.D. 1529-35. Cash. IX.

2. *Anandodaya*. Nylay. Gokulanatha. A.D. 15th cent. Karyamittil.

3. *Saikalpanandodaya*. Varughdrama. Vallabapadiba. 14th cent.

4. *Canaryanandodaya*. Canara. Kankarapattat. Karyamittil. in. A.D. 1590.

5. *Vidyaparnasana*. Adwata. Kandanatipa. in. A.D. 1664-1728. Karyamittil<sup>2</sup>.

6. *Dhamaripa*. Pallakathara. Ed. Bombay. 1859. in many catalogues. For more on this, see Petersen, IV., p. 27.

7. *Krishnaparnasana*. Adwata. Kanchiketha. Pothuvathilaya, father of *Ujjayanthirama* drama.

Tanjore New Cat. Nos. 4427-4428.

8. *Kabiraparna*. Sankaradara.

Tanjore New Cat. 4440. NW. Provinces-Cat. Pt. VII, p. 46.

<sup>1</sup> There seems to be an abridged version of the *Prabodhanandodaya* of Karyamittil.—Laghu *Prabodhanandodaya* Nylaya, Vallabamittil collection No. 129, p. 428, S. K. Mambattar's Devanagari College Calcutta. There seems to be a *Prabodhanandodaya* Karyamittil also in four Dikshas. A MS. of this work is noticed in the Private Diary of Mr. S. A. Sankar, now deposited in the Cambridge University Office, Madras University, on p. 24 of Part I, as existing in the Pyle's Centre, Jan. Eng. Master, Calcutta State (Madras, C.I.).

<sup>2</sup> This author wrote an *Āpavada* allegory called *Jyotashiksha*, (*Karyamittil*) in which Balagan also figures.

9. *Prasadarthotsarga: Chaucaplaya*?

Tanjore New Cat. 488.

10. *Jyauvatsaritsalya: Malladitya*. *Advita*. Mysore I, pp. 276, 437. *Adya* II, p. 276. 10. *Kath*, pp. 1224-5.

11. *Charyyatsalya: Malladitya*? Mentioned by him in his *Jyauvatsaritsalya*. 10. *Kath*, p. 1225a. *Rec* p. 256. *Arbuchi* I, 207; and *Rec* 256. *Malladitya* is the same author.

12. *Sadharanabharatya: Viragbhava*. (D). *Sahasranidya*. Mysore I, p. 288.

13. *Anantaprasanga*—marriage between Anantā, daughter of Pankajara with Nityamala; by Nityabharat of Teglurata, Madras. This play is of little philosophical interest; it is a *lagu-play*, *lakṣya*.

MDSC.<sup>2</sup> 12463.

14. *Vivahajaya*, the triumph of Veda over passions by Ratanaja Kari, son of Patsupura and grandson of Ratanajaya guru, of Virupambedur near Madras.

MDSC. 12613-4. *Adya* II, p. 386.

15. *Ekakavacharavastya*, an *Kyashakam*; by Rajaguru Vilasputra Mra. Jrudava, son of Trivarnatsalya, of Puri, patronised by King Puruparaddeva.

MTSC. 3352.

<sup>1</sup> A strange dramatic composition of his is the *Viragbhavarita*. Tanjore New Cat. 484.

<sup>2</sup> Tanjore New cat. Vol. XIX, p. 58. *Sahasraprasastya* may be a philosophical or religious drama.

<sup>3</sup> Dr. Keith's remark on p. 1225a of his 10-catalogue and on p. 1276b, *Index*, that *Malladitya* is the correct name and 'Nall' is incorrect, is wrong. The name of this well-known South Indian author is *Malladitya*.

<sup>4</sup> MDSC—Descriptive Catalogue of the Madras Govt. Or MSS. Library.

<sup>5</sup> MTSC—Titled Catalogue of the Madras Govt. Or MSS. Library.



16. *Śūnyapāṭhanāṅga*, a short allegorical play in one act; by Bandha. NO. 4986. Bombay Branch R. A. S. 1249-50 and many other catalogues also.

17. *Madantiravandana*, a dramatization of a philosophical debate; by Yamarasina.

Bombay Branch R. A. S. 1252

18. *Pārasparāśāstrānandodaya*, on the union of *Ānandapāramitā* and King Dantavaśa (one of the two names, i.e., *Ānand*), by Jīvanika of Varāṅgator going. The author later became an ascetic. MD&C. 12346-7. MD&C. 14602 is a musical version of the story of this play.

There are 2 copies of a commentary on this drama in the Travancore list of MSS. collected in 1142 Kollam.

19. *Jīvanandapāṭha*.

Adyar II, p. 12a.

20. *Prakāśhodayanāṭika* by Vālikaravandita. The several systems of philosophy dispute here in a debate in the court of King Bhagavarmān.

Mr. Harprasad Sarup, Notices, 18 Series, Vol. III, No. 186, pp. 123-4.

21. *Śrīvāṇīyapāṭhaṇḍa mahodhyanāṅga*; an allegorical play from Orissa; by Haravandita muni who lived under the patronage of Śrīva Mahāyoga Śhaṭṭha, Rājā of Keonjhar. The work ends with Jīvanandika.

Mr. Harprasad Sarup, Report on search for MSS. 1231-1260 Calcutta, published by the Asiatic Soc., Bengal. 1901, p. 18.

22. *Jīvanandodhyanāṭika* by Vālikandika, Jain; Harsal, Carr. Pres. Coll. p. 646 No. 1212. *Grāhantatvavāda*, Aśoka Purandara Dīpambara Jain Śaṅkarāśa Thera, Jhāṅpattan, p. 18.

Peterson, II, 158, III, 401. See Pichai, J. of the Rom. Br. R. A. S., XVIII, p. 221<sup>1</sup>.

23. *Māra, Nārāyaṇa, 1047*. *Tiruvikāṭṭamāyala* contains two allegorical dramatic sequences in which Kāḥ, Dharmā, Vīraḥ, etc. figure as characters. The work as a whole however is not a drama.

24. *Saṃsāraśaṃkṣāṇḍikā* by Tapaśāṇḍa

Cat. of Skr. MSS in the Palam Lib. of Gauḍ., Kath., Kāśh., Sūd. and Kāṇḍav. by Bühler, (II), p. 124, No. 34.

25. *Saṃskṛtāṇḍikā*. MS. dated Sam. 1703, by Anantapada, son of Tryambaka Paṇḍita.

S. R. Khastekar II Year Report of MSS. in Raj. and Centr. India, 1944-5, p. 9.

26. *Vīraśaṃkṣāṇḍikā* by Śiva.

S. R. Khastekar, *Bombay Coll. Cat.* p. 61, No. 12.

27. *Dharmashāṃkṣāṇḍikā* composed in 1682 Śaka, A.D. 1759, by Dharmadatta Govinda who composed a *Dharmodaya* *Ekhyā* also.

*Jour. of the Asian Res. Society*, III, 4, p. 118.

28. *Māyāśāṃkṣā* by Anantashāṃkṣāṇḍikā.

29. *Jñānaśaṃkṣāṇḍikā* by Padmanābha.

The last two are mentioned on page v. fo. of the English introduction to the Gostrow edition of the *Māyāśāṃkṣā* (No. IX).

30. *Saṃsāraṇḍikā* by Jayashāṃkṣa. Peterson's Report, V, p. 181, No. 407.

31. *Tattvasaṃskṛtāṇḍikā*, by Tattva, a prahlaṇḍa south India Vāṇḍava Balaṇḍa poetess, daughter of Udayanḍapuram Veṅkaṭāṇḍikā, author of a *Tattvasaṃskṛtāṇḍikā*.

<sup>1</sup> Pichai's *Agarāḥ*, commentary on Saṃsāraṇḍikā's *Āpāṇḍikā*, is introduced as a female character in this drama.

The bond between 1817-83 and was the wife of Pandit-  
Majidkaran Vithalcharya of Dharmadachar.

(Dr. M. Rameshcharya, M.A., M.L., Ph.D. Sin,  
Poona, pp 42-51, Journals of the Sahas Jubilee of the  
Tatvadrum Sin. School.

12. *Antaryathasatyapariksha*: a dramatic composition by Keshavnada Saravati, published in 4 parts from Calcutta 1858 (?)—1859. This achieves a Vyākṛāṇa-Dharmasāstra, i.e. uncolours at once rules of grammar and moral and philosophical teachings.

British Museum, Printed Books Catalogue, 1895-1906, Column 126.

13. The *Shatpāṇḍyatyāgāṇḍika* by Keshavnada Saravati. Published, Lucknow, 1861. Ibid. 113.

14. *Castyāṇḍika* by Nityāṇḍa dānyāṇḍa; allegorical drama in 1 act. Varanasi, 1866. Ibid. 417.

15. *Itāṇḍi* or *Saravāṇḍi* in 4 acts, dealing with Śyāṇḍa, Dharmasāstra, Dharmasāstra and Vāṇḍyāṇḍa. By Keshavnada Saravati, a Chāṇḍikāṇḍikāṇḍi. Tolly, 1861. Ibid. 112.

16. *Prāṇḍikāṇḍikāṇḍi* by Dharmasāstra, in 2 acts showing up the hurry and immaturity of the Prāṇḍikāṇḍi. Composed in Saravati 1861.

Br. Mus. Pri. Lib. Cat. 1906-09, Col. 114.

17. *Saravāṇḍi* by Dharmasāstra of Potham village (Tanjore Dist) Adyar. Pub. Chelamburam, 1869. Ibid. 1031-2.

18. *Prāṇḍikāṇḍikāṇḍi* by Anantadeva, son of Anantadeva. Numerous MSS. Edn. Bombay Government Press, 1867-68.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> [MSS. 11546 and 11547] Prāṇḍikāṇḍikāṇḍi is a drama, though in its theme which is a controversy regarding the proper obsequial rites to be performed for a dead Prāṇḍikāṇḍi.

Besides there are many late dramas on the lives of the religious leaders, saints and devotees of Śiva and Viṣṇu. Hāṁśakṛpā's career is dramatised in the *Tattvāṅgadya* or *Yadvastarīṅga* by Vāṇśikṛpā of Kāśī (MDSG. 1898-1899, Turpan Cat. 446; Mysore I, p. 121; Adyar II, p. 10c). *Śrīvāṇśatāraṇḍakṛpā*, MDSG. 1893 and 1895, is on the life of one of the Śaivite saints. Such dramas are more truly spiritual; for their portrayal of the religious and spiritual career of such personalities is more effective than the presentation of abstract spiritual ideas as characters on the stage. A love-story makes less and for this purpose, one does not write a play in which Śaṅkara Rāma as a character with Maṇḍa, Yaśa, etc. as other characters. These dramas on the life of saints and devotees are Śāntarāma plays. The *Śāntarāma* or *Śānta* of Kāśī (MDSG. 1880) is a Śānta play of a conception far superior to other specimens though the author is somewhat unequal to the theme. The *Pratibha* says that it is a Śānta play and that the *Śāntarāma* is the only lasting *Rasa*.

सौहार्दिकस्वीयं कर्तुमिच्छिष्यात्ता राजसद्वचनेन राजनेन  
कान्तानिदुर्गम् ।

सुखसाहित्यसम्पन्नसंज्ञेनसद्वचि-

राजसद्वचनेन राजनेनसद्वचिः ।

राजनेन कान्तेन तदा यत्किञ्च यत्किञ्चसद्वचः

सद्वचिःसद्वचः, यत्किञ्चसद्वचिः तदा यत्किञ्च तदा ॥ १ ॥

Author: Maṇḍikṛpā. *Tattvāṅgadya*. No. Ma. Pr. Bho. Cat. 1893-1894, Cat. 323. *Śrīvāṇśatāraṇḍakṛpā* is another strange play as can be seen in the translation of Bhandari Schools in *Tramāṇa*.



Abhinava explains, and which must have been the views of the previous commentators of Bhāṣya, we can guess that Śaṅkara also accepted *Śāste*. Rādhakṛṣṇa recognizes *Śāste* and gives *Saṃnyasta* or *Tatparyasta* as its *Pratyak* or *Śāstya* Ch. VII, 3. He describes it as Śā. 15-20, as Ch. XV.

समस्तान्यस्तुः सान्ते विमलैकान्तान्तो जगति ।

एकद्वयं विमलं दृष्टो दृष्टान् वाचकान् ॥

कल्पकालसाधितान्ते वैष्णवकाला विमले ।

दृष्टानुसन्धेयविष्णुशैवविमले एव जगन्ते ॥

"एकद्वयं दृष्टविमलः । विमलस्तु कल्पविमलकालम् ।

जगन्ते कल्पविमलकालः । " Haradatta, p. 165. K.M. No. 2.

Haradatta adds that it is improper to deny the existence of *Śāste* as a *Rasa*.

"वैष्णवकालस्य दृष्टो वैमलः । जगन्ते । कल्पविमलकाल-  
जगन्ते विमलकालम् । " *ibid.*

Rādhakṛṣṇa recognizes the *Śāste*, illustrates it with the *Nigiranda* and gives *दृष्टानुसन्धेय* as its *Śāstya*. Rādhakṛṣṇa's *Rāya-*  
śāstika might have recognized the *Śāste* in its last chapter  
called *Rastāśāstika*, since Rādhakṛṣṇa follows Śaṅkara to a  
large extent. Bhagya Tata accepts it and from a remark of  
Abhinava at the end of the *Śāste* section in the *Lāṭā*, we  
see that Tata's *Rāyaśāstika* contains an elaborate explanation  
of the objections to *Śāste* and gives a brilliant exposition  
of it as the greatest *Rasa*.

वैष्णवकालेन वाचं जगदुत्तमैकित्वम् । सर्वैकैक्यं दृष्टविमलः ।

न वाचकलक्षणादुत्तमलक्षणेनैव वाचकैक्येन, वाचकैक्येन उल्लिखिते वा-  
चकलक्षणेनैव सर्वैकैक्येनैव जगत् सर्वम् ।" p. 276.

Abhinava accepts it as the greatest Rasa in his three works, his lost commentary on his teacher's *Rasayuktasūtra*, his *Locana* and his *Alaṅkāraśikṣā*. Abhinava's predecessor and successor, the author of the *Caṇḍikā* on the *Uṇṇayikā*, accepts the *Śhanta* but gives the ruling that it can appear as an element in the subsidiary plot of the drama but never as the leading Rasa. (*Locana*, p. 176). This has been pointed out already. The rise of the *Caṇḍikā* represents one stage in the history of *Śhanta*. It grants that *Śhanta* is a Rasa but holds it still unworthy of the honour of being the leading Rasa. The next stage is the recognition of it as an *Ālambitā* Rasa, but permissible as an *Ālambitā* Rasa only in a *Rūpa*, in *Māya*, it should only be a *Prasthāpita* Rasa. The next stage is its complete acceptance, as *Ālambitā* in *Māya* also, and as the greatest of all Rasas, synthesizing all the other Rasas as well. Bhāṣa *Māyā* accepts it and, like Abhinava, holds it as the greatest Rasa. Taking the very first verse of the *Māya* stanza—*brahman brahmā brahmā brahmā*—Bhāṣa *Māyā* imaginatively interprets this as suggesting the *Śhanta* Rasa.<sup>1</sup> 'Brahman brahmā brahmā' does not mean the *Śhanta* which was delivered by Brahmā, but *Drama* which is compared to the Brahman or the Absolute of Vedānta. The *Māya* is like the Brahman; upon him is created the world of drama, as the world upon the substance of the Brahman. *Drama* is *Māyā* and the nature of its reality is *ābhāsaśūnya*. Though fundamentally non-existent in the sense in which the *Māya* and the Brahman exist as realities, both the world and *Drama* do exist. Both help to the attainment of the *Purushārtha*. The meaning of this verse is given by him in his *Madhukārikā* to his now lost *Nyāyasaṅgraha*. See pp. 4-5 *Abhi. Dṛś. Gaṇi*.

<sup>1</sup> *Prat. J. O. R.*, Vol. VI, p. 111, my article, *Writers quoted in the Alaṅkāraśikṣā*.

Side. I. Shāstra Nāgārjuna seems to have accepted as genuine the Śāstra text found in *Ekikāra*.

"...वाचस्पत्योपेक्षितं भविष्यति । क्वं क्वं विविचयन्नाम वाचस्प-  
त्युक्तौ नह ।" इति । तदर्थेन वाचस्पतिं तदोक्तमुच्यते" इति व्याख्यानं  
वाचस्पतिं तदर्थेन । अत्र—

‘वचस्पतिस्तदर्थेनवाचस्पते वाचस्पते नह ।

तदर्थेन वाचस्पत्योपेक्षितौ नह ।’ इति ।

Kyemendru accepts it as can be seen from his *Asoparavāṇa-*  
*śāstra*, pp. 130-1. Following Ashvārṇa and Ananda, he con-  
siders Śāstra as the Root of the Ekikāra. See 57-3 at the  
end of his *Ekikāraśāstra*. While Ananda considers Kāraṇa  
as the Root of the Kāraṇa, Kyemendru considers that the  
Kāraṇa itself is the argument for Śāstra being the ultimate  
Root. See 57. 1 at the end of his *Ekikāraśāstra*. Śāstra  
is the Root of Kyemendru's *Śāstraśāstraśāstraśāstra* and  
most of his other works, *Daśapāda*, etc. Shāstra accepts it  
both in his S. E. I. and Sp. Pra. Most of the later writers  
accept it.

The writers who do not accept Śāstra are mainly writers  
on *Dharmajyotsna* proper. They think they are loyal to Śāstra  
by denying it. The attitude begins (as far as we know now)  
in the *Daśapāda*, the model and source for many a later  
work on *Rūpa*. Dharmajyotsna and Dharmaka, both refuse it  
and argue for its impossibility in drama.

वचस्पतिं क्वचिद् वाचस्पत्योपेक्षितं नह ।’ D. E. IV. 31.

“D. T. Tānagya, M.O.L., misunderstands the Śāstra, the  
Ekikāra which is given here in the Ekikāra of Śāstra, as something  
having nothing to do with Śāstra and as something new and distinct



From this it would appear that Dharmakīrti denies *Śhata* only in drama but accepts it in Kāvya. But, as a matter of fact, Dharmakīrti, as interpreted by Dharmakī, does not accept it even in Kāvya. See p. 124. Mammata then says that the *Śhata* Kāmas are only the eight given by Bharata, but adds afterwards that there is also a ninth Kāma called *Śhata* with Nirveda as its *Śhāntya*, E. Po. IV. 51c. 4 and 11. Dharmakīrti denies it in *Śhāntya*, following one set of writers who opine that Dhanuś gave only eight Kāmas but subsequently mentioned the *Śhata* as accepted by Vātsyā. *Śāngarāṭha* recognises only eight Kāmas in drama and relates *Śhāntya* for holding *Śhata* also as a Kāma, E. A. S. II, p. 371, T. 5-5.

Some of the writers on *Śhāntya* seem to be anxious to object to *Śhata* only in drama, since, in drama which requires the action of a Kāma through its *śāntikāra*, there is no possibility of acting *Śhata* Kāma, which, according to them, is devoid of all activity. The *Śāngarāṭha* however can describe the *Śhata* Kāma, for what cannot be acted can at least be described. The D. E. *Śāntikāra* proposes:

‘सदु कृतकालम् अवलोक्यन्तु ययनि नाम्नेऽनुलेखो नाति,  
कयनि सुखलीलादिमदुल्लंखितययनि कृतकालिमात्राया निमग्नत्वात्  
सुखदिवसने व ययनि ।’ p. 124.

And even this Dharmakī does not grant. For he says that such a state as *Śhata* is the very negation of the possibility of affirming anything of it. For, whatever way in which we can describe it is inexact in as far as we are always describing in words only something which is not like anything of this

form *Śhata*. He says correctly: “Dharmakīrti seems to accept *Śhata* as distinct from *Śhāntya* rasa, which, he thinks, has no place in drama.” (J. C. E., Vol. V, p. 28.)

world. The Upanishads themselves describe the Brahman by saying that it is not this, not that. Such a state can never be made the subject of *Kārya* even.

“सर्वतो हि संसृजः—

“न यत्र दुःखं न क्लेशं न विषादो न देवालो न न कश्चिद्विषादः ।

एतत्तु सान्त्वं कश्चित्ते दुर्लभं, तमेतु योरेतु यमस्तथाः ॥”

कुल्लोकसूक्तम्, सदा एतत् त्रैलोक्यात्मनो नान्यत्तद्व्याप्यमित्युक्तम् ।  
वायुसंस्तवम् सान्त्वं न सान्त्वं कश्चिदेकैकपदाः । सदा हि कुल्लोके न  
एतु मेति मेति कश्चिदेकैकपदाः । <sup>1</sup> D. D. A., p. 124.

This objection of the indescribability of *Brahman* and the impossibility of treating it has already been answered. See above. The *Sūtra* which is said to be absent in that state refers to worldly joy. Visvanātha then replies to Śhaṅkara:

“तुल्यविशुद्धात्मावस्थितो न यत्र न एव यत्र ।

एतन्नेति तदस्मिन् सन्धानेति तिसृभिः न विग्रहाः ॥”

S. D., III, 350. <sup>2</sup>

“यथास्मिन् तुल्यमात्रेणतुल्यं, तस्य त्रैविशुद्धावस्थत्वं

न विधीयते” <sup>3</sup> | S. D. III (under Śūktā 242).

Visvanāthārtha also has answered this and other objections to the *Brahma* in the prologue to his *Sādhakapāṇḍitodhaya*. See D. T. Taniakarya, J. O. R., Vol. V, pp. 18-3, where the passage from Visvanāthārtha is quoted in full.

To grant it as *Kārya* and to deny it as *Brahma* is as absurdly a compromise as the one which grants it inherent

<sup>1</sup> This is evidently a verse drawn an old writer who accepted the *Brahma* and described it in these terms.

Kashira and denotes it conventional usage as a Raza. Kārya is, in essence, only drama and this Abhinavī has emphasized in his *Abhinavakīrti*.<sup>1</sup> If it is possible to develop it as the theme of a Kārya, equally so it possible to handle it as the motif of a drama.

There are other writers who are not so antagonistic towards *Shata* as to deny it totally. They are not *Abhinavādins* but are *Antarabhinavādins*. The aspect called the *quadratic* is no doubt available in Kārya and Nāṭya but one need not recognize it as a special and separate Raza with the name *Shata* which Bharata does not speak of. We can have it and relate it as a variety of one of the Razas already given by Bharata. Thus, for instance, some writers include *Shata* in *Vya* and say that *Shata* is nothing but *Dasyakya*. This view cannot however explain all cases of *Shata* but it owes its origin to the fact that it was Nāṭyārtha that was at first kept at bay by the sponsors and adherents of *Shata*. Others try to include it in *Jugupta*. Inclusion in many other *Shatas* is possible as will be shown in the section on the *Shāloka* of *Shata*. But in all these cases the *Antarabhinavādins* mistake a *Śikṣita*, though an *Abhinavī* can, for the *Śikṣita*. *Vya*, as explaining *Kya*, as *Abhinavopādāna*, can go ill with *Shata* which is the very negation of *Abhinava*. If there are certain varieties of different *Vya* like *Dasyakya*, *Dharmakya* and *Dharmakya*, they must be brought under the *Mahāvya*, viz., the *Shata* and not vice versa. See also *Jugupta*, etc.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *ibid.* *ibid.*, *Chand. Kāv.*, I, p. 170.

<sup>2</sup> See *Śikṣapāraśara*, III.

*Pratyakṣaśikṣa* ॥

Again

*śikṣapāraśara* ॥

*śikṣapāraśara* ॥

There are at least very prominent and frequently appearing accessories. We can say:

www.elsevier.com/locate/jmb

Dogmas, etc. may be some cases of State, not all cases of State. State comprehends all the long-run States or its Psychologies. It cannot be included in anything. STATE-NESS, state's, ~~Statefulness~~~~ness~~—these are, each of them, a kind or a case of State, they cannot define State. It is spite of the fundamental difference between State and Utterance, some want to include State in Vire, because both have Utterance of a Satiric form: as them, all the Russes can be included in Vire, like there is hardly any activity without Utterance. If because of the Stereotype nature of the Utterance in States and Vires, the two are made into one, well can Vire and Russes be made into one, because both carry out the destruction of the society. This Autodestruction is dealt with at greater length in the section on the Subject of State.

[illegible]

the Devotion of Shakti. The mention of Buddha as the avatara of Sat is telling and shows the hand of some writer like Kabiśa. It confirms our surmise in an earlier section of this book that the Buddhists might have entered the Shakti in It is natural that Yamaśāstra clearly stated Saṅgya as the Devotion of Shakti—*śrī Saṅgyaśāstra*. The Abhinavaganana of Harigadhyāya (H), mentions for one Gopāśāstra, makes the supreme spirit, Para Brahman, as the Devotion of Shakti.<sup>1</sup> Regarding the colour of Shakti, one naturally expects it to be pure white, to be in accordance with the purity and knowledge that characterise it. Yamaśāstra says of *śrī Kṛṣṇaśāstraśāstraśāstra*. So also did Abhinava say, according to him, advocates of Shakti changed the text 'śāstraśāstra' into 'śāstraśāstra śāstra', 'śāstraśāstra śāstra' (śrī śāstraśāstra śāstra). Gadh. Edn., I, p. 249. The Vṛta of Shakti is given by Abhinava in the Śāstraśāstra, because the Śāstraśāstra is described by him as that of Saṅgya.<sup>2</sup> 'śāstra śāstraśāstra śāstra'—<sup>3</sup> Abin. Edn., Gadh. Edn., I, p. 245. But, correctly speaking, the real Vṛta of Shakti cannot be any of the four or can be any one of the four in the several situations according to the Vyākhyāna. Thus in the case of a devotee longing Shakti or devotion to a personal God, the Vṛta is Kāraṇa.

The Saṅgyaśāstra of King Harigadhyāya (Madras MS.<sup>4</sup>) which, as will be seen presently, accepts Shakti as a

<sup>1</sup> Madras Govt. Coll. MS. Library, Theosophical Catalogue, 1810/1811, B No 1119.

<sup>2</sup> Regarding this idea regarding, of Śāstraśāstra from Kabiśa, see my article in the Yajña, J. O. R., Vol VII, pp. 31-32.

<sup>3</sup> Theosophical Catalogue, Madras Govt. Coll. MS. Library, B. No. 779 (Chs. 1-3) and 1873 (Chs. 3-6). See J. O. R., Vol. VII, pp. 102-4, my article on the Vṛta. Also, pp. 31-3, Vol. IV, Journal of the Madras Theosophical Society, my article on Later

lose their Rasa and introduce a permanent quintessence Rasa called *Isht Rasa*, which later corresponds to the *Shanta* of others, postulates the *Vyāsa* of this basic *Rasamārasa* as the *Rasikat* *vyāsa*. In the fight of *Vyāsa* with the two demons, *Mādhya* and *Kaishika*, in which incident arose the four *Vyāsa*, *Rasikat* was a spectator and *Haripada* makes this *Tatpartha* *Rasikat* the cause of his *Rasikat* *vyāsa*. This *Vyāsa* he ascribes not only to the *Beffence* rasa, but to *Shānta* and *Adhōbhāsa* also. *Rasikat* is the *Dewat* of *Adhōbhāsa* in the old text of *Shānta* *Shānta*. *Rasikat* is thus the *Dewat* of *Shānta* and *Beffence* *Rasas* according to *Haripada*.

अविद्यया लब्धिरसं स्वाभावजं वृत्तम् ।

देविस्वभावोऽसौ जगदी जगदी भवती तदा ॥

“ . . . . . ”

जगदी भवती भवेदसि जगत्सर्ववृत्तवत्तदा ।

जगदी सर्ववृत्तः स तदा जगत्सर्ववृत्तः—II. Mad. 10th, p. 19

Regarding the *Guna* of *Shānta* *Ānanda* says that *Mādhya* is the *Guna* of *Shānta* (*Sambhoga*), *Vigraha*, and *Karman*. This *Guna* is sweetness and the melting of the heart. Really speaking this *Mādhya* applicable to worldly sweetness or *Grasat* of a worldly nature cannot apply to *Shānta*. Perhaps *Prasāda* may fit *Shānta*, for, above all, *Shānta* is the tranquillity and transparency of the *Chaitanya* or *Anandha* which has become veiled with the dust of this world. *Prasāda* which shows the total absence of *Rāga* and *Dvepa* is the nearest

*Śaṅkha*, *Lakṣṇa* 1036 of *Haripada*'s *Sahasya* *Shānta* are available in the *Adyar* *Col.* II, p. 1034, *Tantra* *Qṛa* 1034 G and *Myra* *Kak* I, 378, entry 7, where there is some misread *Lakṣṇa*.



## III

In this section I propose to speak of some peculiar and original views expressed by some writers on the State Race.

## THE KARAKALINK OF KUDALINGGA

In the section on the *Śālistya* of *Śtata*, it will be seen that *Narveśa*, *Tyāśāpārasāśa*, *Vaidyga*, *Tātrāśīla*, etc. make their claim to be the *Śālistya* of *Śtata*. Each of these helps the other and shades off into the other. All of them form aspects of the one Race of *Śtata*. So it seems to *Kudalingga*, the author of the *Rasakāśikā*, an unpublished work on Race preserved in two parts in two MSS. in the Govt. Oriental Library, Madras (Nos. B. 2291 and 2294<sup>1</sup>). He says first that

<sup>1</sup> The two MSS. make the work almost complete, but there still seems to be some portion missing. On p. 11 of B. 2291, there is a *Chya* on a long named *Arjuna*. The *Rasakāśikā* is identical with the *Rasakāśikā*, which is quoted by *Vātsyāna* in his commentary on the *Karphārasaśāstra* (C. M. Edn.). All the six names cited by *Vātsyāna* are found in the *Rasakāśikā* in these Madras MSS. There are two copies, an original and a transcript, of the *Rasakāśikā* in the Mysore Oriental Library.

There is no indication of the author in the MSS. of this work. But we are able to know that our *Kudalingga* was no sufferer from the national prejudice of a Karnataka teacher in Race, the *Rasakāśikā* of *Silva* (18th cent.). *Silva* says that he derives upon *Arphāśāśa*, *Narveśāśa*, *Kudalinggaśa* and *Vaidyāśāśa*. While dealing with the *Uddigama-Viddigama*, *Silva* says that *Kudalinggaśa* mentions them as four in his *Rasakāśikā* by 11, *Rasakāśikā*, Madras University Kannara Series, No. 5, Ed. by A. Venkat Nayak and Pāśāśa H. (Sankha Ayyangar). On pp. 108-2 of this edn., is found an appendix containing all the passages of the *Rasakāśikā* quoted by *Silva*.





Vitality (which comes down from Rādhā's time), and three absolutely new Rasas, Samāhoga, Viparīkṣā and Bāhira. He expressly says that the last three are new and distinct Rasas according to his view.

सुखरो द्रव्यमप्य न बीजतः कदाचन ।  
 रीते नयनमङ्गलो द्वापरोऽपुनरुत्पन्नः ॥  
 सान्नी वासाभिधः स्यात् सान्नीत्यस्यैव परम् ।  
 सन्नेभ्यो विज्ञेयः स्यात् सान्नेरी बीजतः ॥

F. 14, Madras MS. R. 1011 (Ch. 17).

What his new Rasas, Samāhoga and Viparīkṣā, are and how they differ from the first, viz., Śāntya—does not occur will be taken up in another section. Now we shall restrict ourselves to Rādhā's views on the new Rasa named Bāhira which he holds in addition to find out in the place of the Śānta. What are these two Rasas, Bāhira and Śānta and how do they differ? What are their respective and distinct Sāhityas? What is the necessity for recognizing two such Rasas?

Rādhā gives the Sāhitya of his Rasas thus :

सङ्गतः सप्त रवे<sup>1</sup> सुमुखा बीज त्वा न ॥  
 सङ्गतैव<sup>2</sup> बीजैव विप्रमलनमत् ॥  
 विविध सङ्गतः रीते सङ्गीतं त्वा ॥  
 सन्नेन सान्नेरी स्यात् सान्ने रवेकरीविजः । p. 17, ibid.

He accepts the view that Śānta is the Sāhitya of Śānta and in this acceptance, he seems to have a purpose which

<sup>1</sup> *Sapta* means *Śānta*.

<sup>2</sup> *Sāhitya* is the old Sāhitya of Rādhāśāstra.

we shall see presently. Harpila says further on these lines:

सन्तोषे विदुष्यस्य राजस्येति तथै तदा ।

अविनिष्ठा रात्रिर्नो इतिराजसोदृष्टा ॥ ५. २७.

राज्ञो राज तस्य राजस्योर्निरासः ।

विदुः सिद्धेऽस्य राजस्यै तथैवेति तथैति ॥ ५. ३०

From the latter verse we have to take that Harpila distinguishes the *Śhīta* and the *Bhūta* *Raja*s as differing in the degree of permanence. He calls the *Bhūta*, of which *Raja*s is given as the *Śhīpa*, eternal (*Śhīva*) and permanent (*śhīva*), and from this we have to understand that the *Śhīpa* of which *Raja*s is the *Śhīpa* is permanent (*śhīva* and *śhīva*). While discussing the claims of Harveda born of *Tattva* (*Śhīpa*) to be the *Śhīpa* of *Śhīta*, Abhinava quotes the verse *सर्वं सुखीयस्य*, etc. and points out that the resulting *Śhīta* in *Raja* or *Harveda* is ordinary things in the sphere of our mundane activities, which has no relevance to the fourth *Para* (*Śhīpa*, *Śhīpa*). This *Raja* can be developed into a *Raja* which is a kind of *śhīta*, *Śhīta*. Perhaps, it is to distinguish such a *Raja* as the *Raja*-*Śhīta*, involving a positive attitude towards mundane matters, that Harpila postulated a *Bhūta* *Raja* to refer to a regular activity towards the attainment of *Śhīpa*. No such explanation is however offered by Harpila. The above suggested explanation loses point when it is realized that a *Harveda* in ordinary things must only be a *Śhīta*, and if it is nourished into a *Raja*, it cannot stop short without developing into a *Raja* referring to *Śhīpa*. It is a pity that Harpila has not explained himself more elaborately.

## THE PRAPĀṢHADĀYĀ

The *Prapāśhādāyā*, an anonymous composition, published as No. XLV of the *Tantrasāra Śikṣā*, treats of the subject of Rasa under Hṛya, in the section on the *Glāṅṅhara Yāga*, in the chapter on the *Uparāṅga*. The work approaches Śhanta in a new manner. It says that there are only eight *Sādhya* but agrees that the *Mityarāṅga* gives nine Rasas; it then gives eight *Sādhya* and nine Rasas. It relates those who hold Śhanta as the negation of the other eight and holds it as the creation of all the rasas, *Sarva-rāṅga-samāra*. But what exactly is the Śhanta, it does not say.

“*Śhāntiḥ (vāṅm) vāṅvāṅgā vāṅvāṅgā vāṅvāṅgā । ते च वदन्ति—*

‘*दीर्घाश्च दीर्घा दीर्घादीर्घा वदन्ति ।  
 सुकुमा विन्मयीर्दीर्घा वाक् वदन्ति ।  
 सुकुमास्तवत्वा दीर्घास्तवत्वा ।  
 दीर्घास्तवत्वा वदन्ति वदन्ति ।*’

इति । तदाही वाक् दीर्घा । सुकुमास्तवत्वा । . . .  
 सुकुमास्तवत्वादी वदन्ति इति केचित्तु । तदास्तवत्वा । वदन्ति  
 वदन्तिस्तवत्वा । वाक् दीर्घादीर्घास्तवत्वा वदन्ति वदन्ति ।”

[p. 15—16.]

How can one speak of a Rasa without a *Sādhya*?

## THE ANUPRĀSHADĀYĀ SŪTRA

The *Anuprāśhādāyā* with the Śikṣā gloss of Mahāśheta Hemachandra. (*Āṅgārāṅga Samatā Samatā*) deals with the same

Rasaśāstra of Kṛṣṇa, p. 154 ff. The gloss first explains the Fourfold Rasa theory :

‘अस्मन्मते षोडशविधिरित्युक्तमस्ति न चतुर्विधेति ब्रह्मणः । तस्य-  
पुनश्च अस्मादीयेषु पुनस्तुतिषु तत्तद्व्यवहारोऽप्यस्मान्मे एव दृष्टव्यं विधीयते ।’

The last describes and illustrates the Fourfold Rasa :

विशेष्यव्याप्यव्याप्यवर्तनी त्रीं चतुर्विधेनम् ।  
अविद्यालक्षणी त्रीं त्रीं चतुर्विधे त्रिं चतुर्विधे ॥

चतुर्विधे त्रीं चतुर्विधे—

तत्तद्व्यवहारविधौ तत्तद्व्यवहारविधौ त्रिं चतुर्विधेनम् ।  
त्रीं चतुर्विधे त्रिं चतुर्विधे त्रिं चतुर्विधे त्रिं चतुर्विधे ॥

अथ

विशेष्यव्याप्यव्याप्यवर्तनी त्रीं चतुर्विधेनम् ।  
अविद्यालक्षणी त्रीं त्रीं चतुर्विधे त्रिं चतुर्विधे ॥

चतुर्विधे त्रीं चतुर्विधे—

तत्तद्व्यवहारविधौ तत्तद्व्यवहारविधौ त्रिं चतुर्विधेनम् ।  
त्रीं चतुर्विधे त्रिं चतुर्विधे त्रिं चतुर्विधे त्रिं चतुर्विधे ॥

Besides the Fourfold Rasa, the commentator explains that the Viraṇa in the text has two additional varieties called Tyāgavira and Tyāgavira, both of which are superior to the third variety called Vaidharvira. It further explains that Tyāgavira, Tyāgavira and the Fourfold are Rasas which are not brought into existence by any “Sādhana” like Asya, Pradhāna, etc. Vaidharvira involves Pratyakṣa, destruction of others; Adhāna is caused by “hyperbole”, Alāpaka, which is a species of falsehood. None of the later

## THE SENSE OF ŚHĀLA

What is it said that Bhāṣya did not speak of the Śhāla Rāsa, it follows that he did not mention any Śhālyas which developed into that Rāsa. One of the chief arguments of those who do not accept Śhāla is that Bhāṣya did not give its Śhālyas. Says the *Leṣanā*:-

“सु सुखं भवति यदा । यदा तु सुखं भवति  
सुखं । सुखं भवति ॥” p. 178.

The reply to this objection to Śhāla must show that not only is a Śhāla Rāsa possible from a Śhālyas  
a Rāsa. But Śhāla, but also that the Śhālyas is available in Bhāṣya's text itself. In certain writers who held Śhāla as the Śhālyas of Śhāla referred with Bhāṣya's text. The result of this interference is seen in three places. The first two are translations of Bhāṣya's *Āṅgīkāra* concerning the Rāsa and the Śhālyas.

“सुखं + वीर्यसद्वृत्तये विवर्तते यदा सुखं”  
became “सुखं + वीर्यसद्वृत्तयाम् यदा यदा सुखं” ।  
And “सुखं विवर्तते विवर्तयते यदा सुखं” was read as  
“सुखं विवर्तयते यदा सुखं” ॥

Abhinava has these remarks on these two texts :

“राजराजवर्षिण्युः पञ्चमिति नव पञ्चमि ।”<sup>10</sup>

“एव राजराज पञ्चमी ‘विश्वम्भराः’ इति वैभित् वरित् ।”<sup>11</sup>

Quest. Edn., Vol. I, p. 268

The first case of interpolation is a complete interpolation of a section on *Śāstra* in Ch. VI. (Quest. Edn., I, p. 242) The Kīrṇamīṭi and the Kīrti editions of the B- S. do not have the section on *Śāstra* in Ch. VI. In this interpolated section, *Śāstra* is given as the Śāhitya of *Śāstra* :

“एव राजराजे राज राजराजविश्वम्भराः शेषम्भरीकः ॥”<sup>12</sup>

That this section was absent in certain MSS. and that certain recensions created only eight *Rāgas* is known from Abhinava's own remarks. Abhinava says :

“एव न विश्वम्भराःपञ्चमि राजराजविश्वम्भराः इव-  
म्भराः ‘राजराजे राज राजराजविश्वम्भराः’ इति विश्वम्भराः पञ्चमी ॥”<sup>13</sup>

Quest. Edn., I, p. 240.

This remark will make it clear that the section on *Śāstra* *Rāga* is not exactly the end of Chapter VI as now found in the Quest. edn., but the beginning of the section treating of all the *Rāgas*, i.e. below the subsection on *Śyāghra*. There is no doubt on this point that the section on *Śāstra* preceded the section on *Rāga* and appeared even before *Śyāghra*, in some old MSS. which Abhinava consulted. For Abhinava makes an additional score out of the priority of *Śāstra* in the treatment of *Rāga*. He says that it is because the Śāhitya of *Śāstra* is Śāhitya *par excellence*, being the *Rāga* itself on which arise the comparatively less basic Śāhityas, *Rāga*, etc., and because all *Rāstratika* is of the form of

Śhuka, being Alankāra and free from worldly links, Śhuka is the greatest Raja, and hence it is that it is dealt with at the very beginning.

“—पुनः (पुनः) कथंविनाशविनाशं वृद्धविनाशः ।”

Chak. Sūtr., I, p. 140.

Who may be the author responsible for introducing the Śhuka texts is the R. U.? It is not possible to say anything definite. All we know now is that Uddhaga, the author of the now known regular commentaries on Bhāṣya, accepts the Śhuka as a man from his R. A. S. S. which however mentions not its Śhālyas. Pradhānadhikāya gives the Śhālyas and he speaks of Śhuka as the Śhālyas of Śhuka.

For those who believe in the genuineness of these texts on Śhuka as Bhāṣya's own, there is no difficulty in answering the objection that Śhuka cannot be accepted for the reason that Bhāṣya did not mention at all its Śhālyas. For according to them, Bhāṣya gave some Rajas, mentioned Śhuka as the Śhālyas of Śhuka and described Śhuka as the greatest Raja.

One of the main objections against Śhuka being accepted as the Śhālyas of Śhuka is that the texts which say so cannot be relied upon as genuine because of their absence in some recensions. Also because of the fact that the Rajas have spoken of would make the number of Rājās fifty and Bhāṣya gives only forty-two. Therefore some advocates of Śhuka put forward Harvada as the Śhālyas, Harvada being one of the forty-two given by Bhāṣya. Those advocates of Harvada did not however mention Śhuka. Another objection, an imaginary one, is that Śhuka and Śhuka are synonymous and the former cannot be the Śhālyas of the latter. Śhuka and Śhuka differ even as Bhāṣya and Bhāṣyāṣṭa, Vākyas



and Addhata and Hāra and Hāpa. The former is Localia, the latter Abhāta. Says Abhinava:

दृग्दृशयोः पर्यायं ॥ दृग्दृशयोर्वा व्यत्ययम् । विद्वान्-  
व्या व्यतिविद्येन (विद्विदानीविद्येन) दृग्दृशयोर्व्यात्ययः न  
वैत्ययः व्यत्यययोर्वा व्यत्ययेन । Gark. Edn., I, 338

Both the above-mentioned objections to Vāna are then set forth by Abhinava, under, as Parappaka:

“दृग्दृशे न दृग्दृशे, दृग्दृशयोः पर्यायम् (1), दृग्दृश-  
व्यात्ययः इति व्यत्ययव्यात्यय (2) ।” p. 333, 334

Radhakṣa comes next to Uddhaka in the discussion on the  
Śāhitya of Vāna. He mentions Vāna as  
a Saṃyagjñāna a Rāsa and gives its Śāhitya as Saṃ-  
yagjñāna. Namastakha clearly says that  
Radhakṣa gives Saṃyagjñāna as the Śāhitya.

दृग्दृशव्यत्ययि, दृग्दृशे विद्येव्यात्ययोः पर्यायः ।

दृग्दृशव्यत्यये विद्ये दृग्दृशे दृग्दृशे व्यत्ययः ॥ Ch. av., 15.

दृग्दृशव्यत्यये पर्यायः—Namastakha.

Evidently Radhakṣa did not rely on the Vāna text in  
Bhāṣya. 14-15- but was bold enough to hold Rāsa not  
mentioned by Bhāṣya. So he left out Vāna and put forward  
Saṃyagjñāna as the Śāhitya of Vāna. If Saṃyagjñāna means  
the realization of the self, it becomes the causal antecedent of  
Vāna. Saṃyagjñāna is Tatvajñāna and all writers following  
Bhāṣya, have given it as one of the Vidyās of Vāna. But  
Namastakha does not make any difference between Saṃyagjñāna  
and Vāna. Under Radhakṣa's name, commenting the Rāsa,  
Namastakha enumerates the Śāhitya, the Vyākhyāna, etc.  
And here, he gives Vāna as the Śāhitya of Vāna.

We are not able to know what Ekiba was held as Ichijyū by Lohjō and Fudōke. Some of the views on the Ichijyū of Ekiba contained in the Abamarakibō may be the views of these two commentators. To those views we shall turn presently. Before that we shall examine the views of authors whose works are available to us. Amakurawakana accepts the Ekiba Kō, criticises the views of the opponents of Ekiba and determines the character of the Ekiba. He does not hold Fuma or Hirata as an Ichijyū, but gives Tōyōkuryōkoku as an Ichijyū. He says:

<sup>1</sup> वाचस्पत्युपाध्यायविरचिते शब्दरत्नाकरे, अत्राक्षरी (अ) अक्षरम्  
एव । तस्य प्रमाणम्—

<sup>11</sup> *See* *supra* note 1, at 100 (quoting *United States v. Gurnea*, 198 F.2d 101, 103 (2d Cir. 1955)).

www.elsevier.com/locate/jmb

2017年12月15日

## THEORY

<sup>22</sup> सुत्तान्तरे विज्झासत्ते नः क्वचः कर्म्मोपनिबन्धनं भित्तिरः लोकेन  
 कृतं नान्यं नः एतावतीपुत्तस्य भित्तिरेव एतावताल्लोकाः लोकेन लब्धो नान्य  
 नः कर्म्मोपनि ॥ ३३ ॥

The non-acceptance of *Shiva* shows that *Aranda*-*varhuna* did not accept or follow the *Shiva* sect in *Shivaria*. His *Schäfer* for *Shiva* is that happiness which is the cessation of all desires—*Typh-keps-ukha*—and is inspired by *Vylen*, whom *Mahabharata* *Aranda* is going to represent as a *Shiva*-epic in the next *Uddipeta* of his work. If however we take that *Typh* as an *Uddipeta* for all *Shiva*, this *Schäfer* will become identical with the *Shiva* or the *Parvata*.

of all Concepts. That the Śākyas also will, in some way, become a form of State is accepted by Ānanda when he distinguishes the State from the Vira in which certain opposites include the State. Ānanda says:

"एतं न शक्यं व्युत्पन्नव्यवस्थितं विद्मः ।" p. 177.

And the Locust has interpreted Avasthāparivṛtta as *Merhava*. Ramanandā, a follower of Ānanda and Abhinava, equates Ānanda's *Typakavya* with *State*:

"...दृष्टान्तस्तत्र साधितव्यः सर्वो ह्यस्य, दृष्टो ह्यस्य ।"

E. A., p. 23.

The Locust informs us that there were some who, not satisfied with *Typakavya*, gave the complete details of all the Concepts, the modifications of the mind, as the Śākyas. Abhinava replies that if this is meant as a negative state, it too hardly be a State, for a negative state cannot be a state or State; if however it is meant as a positive state marked by the absence of all the Concepts, it comes to the same thing as that state of mind which is marked by the annihilation of all dross.

यस्य तु सर्वविपर्ययस्य दृष्टव्यं सर्वत्र नान्यत्र । तद्वदस्य,  
यस्य सर्वविपर्ययस्य सर्वत्र नान्यत्र नान्यत्र । सर्वत्र  
तु सर्वत्र दृष्टव्यं ॥ Locust, p. 177 (Reconstructed).

There are others, the Locust continues, who quote a verse from Bhartṛṃ on State as the one basic form of which the other States are transformations and hold that state of the mind when it is itself and is free from any transforming condition, as the Śākyas of State. Abhinava

says that this also differs only slightly from *Tryptopaya*. While *Acanthopora* *interposita* is a state of *Palaeobolus* of *Trypt* etc., *Tryptopaya* refers to a state of the Freshwater-bolus of *Trypt* etc. The externalization of *Trypt* is the natural process; we see in organisms the polluted *Cera* gradually dissolving.

[illegible]

Blaga, given. Edg: as the Ethics of Plato in his  
SocraticDialogues, pp. 114-115.

 

<sup>12</sup>— दूधियादिनाम, अदुधयासेव्यादिनि, अदुधियादीनां नाम-  
द्वयविशिष्टमप्यस्य, विनाशः तस्य दृष्टव्योऽर्थः । <sup>13</sup>

...and, in the end, the only way to win is to win.

What is this Dignity? Dignity means Foremost, Containment and Joy. All the three are pertinent. But Dignity means only containment, Foremost, Joy. His illustration is :

[illegible]

2000 年 12 月 15 日

This contention again is not far off from Tyndale's or Pina. Thaja mentions Pina here as being held by others and he agrees that it comes under Diga. Perhaps the reason why Diga did not choose Pina is that it is not found in Brown's list of 49 Shivas. Diga is found there. Elsewhere Thaja gives the same Pina as a variety of the Tyndalean called Ma. in 313. *Shikha; mō ma; Ma*

<sup>4</sup> See also the Salazar response, TSS-144, p. 58, where the view of Elcano is noted. The R. M. does not acknowledge the Salazar.



to Bharata, a Shiva not to be found among Bharata's forty nine Shivas. While Shiva tried for some time to get over the difficulty by picking out Shiva from the 49, there were earlier writers who took the very first Vyākhyāna Śivada and proposed to treat it as a Shiva, which was both Vyākhyāna and Shākyā. The *Abhinavabhāratī* says:

“समस्तानामे विवेचिताय शायी ; एतन्मिव उन्मत्तमौल्येभिर-  
कृतानाम अथवातुल्येऽप्यसौ पूर्वं विहितः ।” *Garb. Edn.*, pp. 263-70

“यः शायी कृतानुज्ञा (मेधाविमानसमदुःखान्येभिर) विपद्युः,  
केवा (शायी) कथमिवाः । एतन् विमलः, विभावसी, उन्मत्तमौ-  
ल्यो भिन्नः इति केचित् । स्या हि—एतद्व्याख्यानस्य ये विवे-  
चिताः एव, हेतुवत्तद्व्याख्यानैककल्पात् । एतद्व्याख्यानस्य च एतद्वै-  
शेष्यं इति, कथंवा वातुल्यो इति स्या च परेत् ।” *ibid.* p. 334

The problem that has to be faced first in the postulation of Shiva as a Rasi. The first objection against it is that Bharata has not given us Shākyā. To answer this criticism, certain advocates of Shiva say that Bharata has given the Shākyā of Shiva in his text; it is Narada. But how did these advocates of Shiva discover that it was Narada? Bharata does not say so; Bharata gives it as a Vyākhyāna-Shiva, the first among them. The reply is that Bharata's mention of Narada at the head of the Vyākhyāna and immediately after the Shākyā, has a meaning. Narada is a deity for objects and as such, is unexceptional. Amalgama Sage Bharata is one who unites unexceptional and so his mention of Narada as the first asks us to explore a hidden meaning (अपह्नव एव वातुल्ये). It is to show us that, though it is unexceptional, it is given as the first, shakti, while being a

Vyākhyāna, it is also a Śāṅkhya, the Śāṅkhya of the Karma called Śtāva. If it is not for the suggestion of this Prapñca, Bhāṣya would not have given the unimportant Narvada first. Then comes the question: Is Narvada itself the Śāṅkhya? Narvada is born of broken love, poverty or many more causes. What variety of it is exactly the Śāṅkhya of Śtāva? Bhāṣya describes Narvada thus in Ch. 7

नर विभेदो यम एतद्विषयात्मनश्चरितोऽनुद्वेगोऽप-  
द्वयवर्तिनोऽनुवृत्तवर्तिनि विनये कल्पते । *Guṇ. Edn.*, I, p. 317.

Bhāṣya here gives many causes as producing Narvada. One of these varieties of Narvada is that born of Tattvajñāna. It is Narvada for all worldly things. This Narvada alone is relevant as a consideration of the Śtāva Karma. It is this Narvada born of Tattvajñāna that is held as the Śāṅkhya of Śtāva by those who are anxious to have the authority of Bhāṣya. But how can a Vyākhyāna become a Śāṅkhya? It is said that only such Narvada as is born of broken love, poverty, etc. is Vyākhyāna. The same Narvada when it is born of Tattvajñāna and shows all worldly things becomes the permanent Śāṅkhya. Says Śrīrāghava:

एवमेव न्यायिणीनेन लक्षणाभेदोऽपि ।

एतद्विभेदोऽनुवृत्तवर्तिनो यद्विषयसिद्धेः ॥ *Śrīrāghavaśāstra*.

Such Narvada becomes greater not only than other kinds of Narvada but also than all the other Śāṅkhyas and Vyākhyānas, all of which it subordinates. Says Abhinava while expounding the case of Narvada:

लक्षणात्मकं विधिं लक्षण-भेदोपपत्तेः । यद्विषयवर्तिनोऽनुवृत्त-  
वर्तिनश्च न यम एवविशेषो न एव हि लक्षणवत्तुल्यवृत्तवर्तिनः ।

*Guṇ. Edn.*, I, p. 314.





as *Vāka* is the *Schilya* of *Karasa*. These are not brought to the front and commented at the beginning along with *Mirveda*.

Another possible objection to having *Mirveda* as *Schilya* also besides a *Vyākhyāna* is that a *Bhāṣa* which *Bhāṣya* has definitely mentioned as a *Vyākhyāna* cannot be taken as a *Schilya* also. But as this the reply comes out that *Bhāṣa* himself gives a hint, taking which it can be proved that the status of *Schilya*, *Vyākhyāna* and *Sādhana* of the forty-two *Bhāṣa* are not merely belonging only to those given under those names but that any of the forty-two may, according to the circumstances, become any of the three. This is the pre-*Abhinavagupta* view of the nature of the forty-two *Bhāṣa* and the names *Schilya*, *Vyākhyāna* and *Sādhana*. As a consequence of this view, there grew a tendency which expressed itself from the times of *Rudrata* and *Lollata* up to the time of *Hoja*, that *Bhāṣa* are not eight or ten only, but forty-two. The last mentioned above and referred to by these theorists is contained in *Bhāṣa*'s text on the *Vyākhyāna* of *Ka* where he mentions *Paṇḍita*, a *Schilya*, as one of the professional.

अविधायिभ्यश्च नान्यथैवमुक्तमवधार्य ।

Gauḍ. Edn., I, p. 307.

This means that *Bhāṣa* himself suggests that *Schilyas* may become *Vyākhyāna* and *Vyākhyāna*, *Schilya*. This view is stated as follows by *Abhinava*, an *Īśvaragṛha* :

सूत्रम् न अविधायिभ्यो नृणां विविक्तुमि वाचना कर्मणो  
अविधायिभिरपिवाचनम् (विवाच)¹ ननुवाचमि विचक्षण-  
विशिष्टमि सुवर्णैवमुक्तमि ननुवाचमि । Abh. Edn., p. 124.

¹ *Manu Smṛiti* (10/1).

Akhilana criticizes this view. He does not accept the Nirveda born of Tattvagñāna as the Śūnyatā of Sthāna. If such Nirveda as is born of Tattvagñāna is the Śūnyatā, it means that Tattvagñāna is the Vāhidatā. The other Vāhidatās given, namely Vairāgya, Samādhi, etc., are not Vāhidatās strictly. If they are included as Vāhidatās because they are causes producing Tattvagñāna, they are really the causes of the cause. The cause of the cause is never called Vāhidatā. Further, Nirveda itself is an aversion towards all objects and is not different from Vairāgya. Far from being the product of Tattvagñāna, Nirveda is one of the causes keeping about Tattvagñāna. For it is one having aversion to mundane things that strives after Moksha and attains Tattvagñāna. It is well-known that Moksha is directly attained through Tattvagñāna, and it is not true to say that one attains Tattvagñāna first, then gets aversion and then attains Moksha. Ivaṁbhūta also says that Vairāgya is not the final stage preceding Moksha, that Vairāgya at best results only in Pratyāhāra in the absence of Tattvagñāna. Tattvagñāna alone results in Moksha.

\*Brought up by the court on 11/11/2010

### Save the Year of Cambridge! Save

यदा यदाभिद् वेदमयसि, न वल्लहासि, ललापललाप-  
ललापललाप । यदा यदाभिद् यदायुःकालावधायकसि  
ललापे, न वल्लहासि ।

It may be said that *Tetraptiles elongatus* Fairley and increases it. Fairley also says that Fairley towards Cuzco results from *Tetraptiles* (Paraphyly). Page 510, 1, 10 and several others. But Volas, in his study

on this issue, says that such *Vairagya* is really [*Ekagradhā* वा० का० वैराग्य, *Jaaschke-Wiemers* Edn., p. 35]. Therefore it comes to *Tattvagrhā* strengthening and increasing itself from stage to stage. The result is then is no *Nirveda* as *Sādhya* but only *Tattvagrhā*. It is the *Sādhya* of *Śānta*.

Swami Bharata speaks in Ch. 7 (the *Śāntaślokyāḥ*), while describing *Nirveda*, of the *Nirveda* that is born of *Tattvagrhā*. This *Tattvagrhā* or *Sanyagrhā* and the *Nirveda* born of it do not refer to *Śānta* *Rasa* and its *Sādhya*. But refer only to the ordinary and common *Nirveda* born on one realising that he has wasted his energies in a worthless cause through mistake, as is saying a man who would not pay—*पणं प्रत्यागच्छति* etc. Such *Nirveda* can be a *Sādhya* only.

The advocate of *Nirveda* quotes now *Akṣapāda* against *Tattvagrhā*. *Akṣapāda*, he states, says in his *Nṛtya* *Śloka* 1, 1, 2 that the removal of *Śāntagrhā*, i.e. the appearance of *Tattvagrhā*, produces the destruction of *Dosa*, i.e. produces *Vairagya*. This *Tattvagrhā* or *Nirveda* or *Tattvagrhā* or *Vairagya* is the *Sādhya*. The *Nirveda* or *Vairagya* is the final stage and not *Tattvagrhā* which is only one of the stages of *Vairagya*. The reply to that is thus given in the *Śāntaślokyāḥ*: Swami *Akṣapāda* speaks of *Vairagya* but who said *Vairagya* is *Nirveda*? *Nirveda* is an attitude of aversion and a continued sadness and as such, is hardly identical with *Vairagya*. *Śloka*, for which we are now postulating the *Rasa* *Śānta* *Śānta*, is a state of *Kamodha* in which there is neither the sorrow nor the joy of this world. *Vairagya* is the cessation of *Raga* and *Dveṣa* and is not identical with *Nirveda*. Even if we accept that *Nirveda* is *Vairagya*, it does not follow from *Gastana's* words that *Vairagya* or *Nirveda* is the *Sādhya* of *Śānta*. According to the *Śānta* of *Gastana*,

ସମସ୍ତେ ପରିତ୍ୟଜ୍ୟମସ୍ତୁପାତ୍ୟମି ବସତ୍ରମସ୍ୟାମି,

it is not the immediately preceding condition of *Shukla*. From *Yajñgya*, activity (*Shreyas*) must stop, from cessation of activity, birth must stop and when birth ends, misery flies away; when misery has fled, it is *Shukla*.

Lastly, there is no good reason why one should take so much trouble, qualify it as *Karveda* born of *Tatvadrishya* and call it *Yajñgya* and stick to *Hirveda*. Such a cumbersome and elaborately described *Karveda* is only another name for the simple *Yama* which can be the *Shākyas* of *Śhukla*.

Other views on the *Shākyas* of *Śhukla* are also available in the *Abhimanihuṇḍ*. Certain writers  
 1. *Yama*                      hold *Usha*, the *Shākyas* of *Yama*, as the  
                                  *Shākyas* of *Śhukla* also. *Abhimanihuṇḍ* says:

‘*यथा यमः शक्यते ।*’ p. 309.<sup>1</sup>

How did some writers come to hold *Usha* as the *Shākyas* of *Śhukla*? *Usha*, as given by *Śhukla*, is the *Shākyas* of *Yama*. It is said that there are three or four varieties of *Yama*, *Ekavyas* and *Dasyas* being two of them. The variety named *Dasyas* is exhibited in the acts of sacrifice of *Śhukla* and is denominated by *Hara* as his *Shākyas* is very much akin to *Śhukla*. So much so that some protagonists of *Śhukla* say that there is no need for a name *Śhukla* and that the occurrences in discussion come under *Dasyas*.

‘*यः यमः सः ‘शक्यते’ एव शक्य, यमः । यथा यमः शक्यते । शक्यते शक्यः । यमः शक्यः । यथायथा शक्यते यमः ।* ...  
 यमः ।’<sup>2</sup>

*Abhi. Dh., Gosh. Edn.*, I, pp. 367-378.

‘*यथा यमः सः यमः शक्यते । यथायथायथा यमः, यमः शक्यः ।* ... , *Shākyas* ... यमः यमः शक्यः ।

*Shākyas, Shākyas.*



They had to resort to quibbling with *rasaprasaṅga-sampradāya*, *Uchāḥita-sampradāya*, etc. The opponents of Uchāḥita, the group of Raga and Jugal to whom we shall come presently, had the advantage of being one of the eight *Sādhya* themselves mentioned by Bhāsa, as the *Sādhya* of *Śhanta*, also. But then arose the problem: how could one *Sādhya* keep two *Rasa*s? The difficulty was overcome by accepting variation of the same *Sādhya*. It was even as *Karveḥa* being made into a special species called *Tatrasādhikarja*. *Karveḥa*, *Karveḥa* form of the knowledge of Truth. *Hita*, also has many varieties. *Rasa* is divided into *Sambhoga* and *Vipra-kambha*.

The object who held Uchāḥita as the *Sādhya* of *Śhanta* had no need. They knew not what they were doing. The opponents at once undermined them by suggesting the inclusion of *Śhanta* in *Yas*. One of the main *Purupāṇas* in *Śhanta* is the possibility of its inclusion in one of the eight *Rasa*s mentioned by Bhāsa. *Ānanda* mentions this objection and replies:

“यः स्यात् वीर्यवर्धनं यत्तु युक्त । तस्य वीर्यवर्धनमेव  
व्यवधानम् । तस्य च महाप्रवर्धनव्यवधानं विधीः ॥”

“तमेव वीर्यवर्धनव्यवधानेन वीर्यं वीर्यवर्धनं, यत्तु-  
वैद्वेदोऽपि तथा वदति ।” *Itan. 2*, pp. 177-8.

The *Daśarūpāśāstraka* says:

“यत्तु तु वीर्यवर्धनं व्यवधानं विधीः ।”

The real position of the *Sādhya* called Uchāḥita is this: Uchāḥita closely attends upon *Ānandha*, without which there cannot be any activity. No *Rasa* is possible without these two elements. *Raja* garners the *Rasa* and discovers his

Absolutist theory of Karma. But according to the rule of pre-dominance, *Prakṛityasyaiva*, it is Viśva in which this Utiṣṭha is connected most. This Viśva is held to have four varieties, *Yoddha*, *Dharmā*, *Dhīra* and *Daya* Viśva. Of this *Yoddha* is Viśva proper. Utiṣṭha is however *śālistya* of the other three varieties also. Thus Utiṣṭha is the very basis of all action and as such can be seen in some varieties of *Viśva*. Two such varieties are *Daya*-*Viśva* and *Dharmā*-*Viśva* which are really names of two aspects of *Viśva*. *Viśva* is a wider field, it includes *Daya* and *Dharma* but is not included in or exhausted by these two. Numerous are the religious and paths of action towards spiritual redemption. Why these two *Viśva* of *Daya* and *Dharma* only? *Dharma*-*Viśva* can be a form of *Viśva*. *Dhīra* may stand for *Tyāga* also. *सर्वज्ञं सत्त्वसाध्यं*. Even *Yoddha*-*Viśva* can be a form of *Viśva*; there are those who fight religious crusades for the defence of their faith. Somewhat there can be a variety of *Viśva* called *Prakṛitya*-*Viśva* which Jaganātha humorously introduces.<sup>1</sup> Study of texts,

<sup>1</sup> *Sampradāyānāṁ*, K. M. vol. 3, pp. 10-11. *सत्यं सत्त्वं सत्त्वसाध्यं सत्त्वसाध्यं सत्त्वसाध्यं*. (p. 11) Ignored the numerous kinds of the four old *Viśva*, *Satyā*, *Prakṛitya*, *Daya*-*Viśva* and *Dharma*. The *Prakṛitya* means a numberless varieties of the *Viśva*, while denoting *Dhīra*. *Prakṛitya* is the *Dharmā*-*Viśva* given in the *Āraṇyaka*, *Viśva* 21-27.

एतं सत्त्वसाध्यं सत्त्वसाध्यं सत्त्वसाध्यं ।

सत्त्वसाध्यं सत्त्वसाध्यं सत्त्वसाध्यं ।

सत्त्वसाध्यं सत्त्वसाध्यं सत्त्वसाध्यं ।

सत्त्वसाध्यं सत्त्वसाध्यं सत्त्वसाध्यं ।

सत्त्वसाध्यं सत्त्वसाध्यं सत्त्वसाध्यं ।

सत्त्वसाध्यं सत्त्वसाध्यं सत्त्वसाध्यं ।

सत्त्वसाध्यं सत्त्वसाध्यं सत्त्वसाध्यं ।

knowing their true import and propagation of their teachings here part of His activities. These produce *Pradipavats* in the people who has to meet and win adversaries in debate. So also there is *Kundavina* which also *Jaganatha* points out. *Kund* is a virtue of very great importance in *Shiva*. So *Uttha* is not *Shiva*; *Shiva* comprehends many kinds of *Uttha*. That is, several kinds of sublimating *Utthas* are *Vyabhidhans* in *Shiva*. *Devi-Uttha*, *Idam-Uttha*, etc. are very frequent and are intimately related *Vyabhidhans* in *Shiva*. Even the sage who has realized Truth and has become, like *God*, *Ekatapta* and *Avigrahasamashkita*, has yet embodied existence in this world as *Jivanmukta* and naturally, like *God*, he also stops not from sustaining action for the sake of the world. The Lord says:

by the respective national flag-bearing states

**संस्कृतभाषाशास्त्रम्** कर्तुं सद्यः यः कार्यमिति ।। *साधुः, विद्वान्, शिष्टः, उच्चैः* ।।

Thus, Usalia of each address corrected as in Dismaria, Dayvira, Dhamaria, etc. is an intimate necessary (and only an account) in Florida. (See Address.)

“कदाचिन्मि श्व कृतकृत्यस्य चार्ज्यव्यवहारस्येव उत्पन्न इति उल्लासो-  
त्तम कोपव्यवहारस्यैवामयस्यस्यो दयस्वत्वात्तस्यैव अर्थव्यवहारोत्पत्तयः । ननु  
ननु तस्य किञ्चित् दयस्वत्वात्तस्यैव व्यवहारस्येव, ननु च किञ्चित् दयस्वत्वात्तस्यैव ।”

Author: **Robert M. Clark**, Editor, *1998*

[Back](#)
[Previous Page](#)
[Next Page](#)
[Home](#)

**Keywords:** child sexual abuse; disclosure; social support

[Download](#)
[View](#)
[Download](#)

1. **Introduction**

www.elsevier.com/locate/jmb

all other cases, strong recommendations to **Recommendation: Evidence**



There is a saying that for those who would have this world, there is no hope for the other.

† Jambh. Only he who detests all material things can walk to salvation. For this, he must

restrain the feeling of desire or lustiness towards the things of this world. This is the Rāsa of Jaganat. Some hold this to be most important in Śāstra and propose it for the place of the Śrībhāṣa.<sup>1</sup> 'सुखेति स्वरसः' *Abh. Bhā., Cank. Bhā.*, I, p. 262.

Śaṅka Tāra has made some contribution to this Jaganat and its relation to Śāstra. In Śā. 97-102, Ch. VI, Śaṅka speaks of the varieties in each of the eight Rāsa and here he says of Rāśānna

कीलक कीलकः पुनः खेले रसः खिलेन ।

विश्रुतिविश्रुति कीलके खिलेति ॥ 101.

Rāśānna is of two kinds, Kīlaka and Udvēgi. But in the first line, there is an additional word Śukāṭha. Commentators took it as qualifying Kīlaka and they distinguished the Udvēgi variety as Jambhā. But Śaṅka Tāra said that Rāśānna is of three kinds: Kīlaka, Śukāṭha and Udvēgi. The Gaud. Śā. gives a reading here which has 'सुखेति' for 'सुखं खिलेन'. Tāra explains Śukāṭha Jaganat as the Rāga or the so-called pleasure of the world. Such Jaganat is illustrated by poems of Vāstava in which women and the like are denounced. This is a very powerful aid to Māhāt. When passions assail and evils tempt, Patañjali asks us to contemplate the other side of the pleasure, the attendant misery, etc., and begin to loathe them.

<sup>1</sup> Nirveda is very closely allied to this Jaganat.

<sup>2</sup> Just as Nirveda which is born of Tattvabhāsa becomes Māhāt, Jaganat for worldly objects becomes Śukāṭha.

<sup>1</sup> इतिहासवाचिदर्थानामो चीन्हाः (१) चीन्हाकान्तरात् । यद्वा विद्यादिभ्यः क इत्येते इत्यर्थे यत्तदिति, चीन्हात्, चात्प्रतिपादकत्वात् ।

[illegible]

2000 2001 2002 2003 2004 2005

But Tseno did not have the reading 'मृग्य स्थितिम्' for the manuscript the text 'मृग्य स्थितिम्'. He says that though there are really three kinds, Shikha's speaks of two, because of the rarity of persons having the Middle Jewel.

<sup>11</sup> *“Baptism: neither more collective nor more private.”*

1992

So it is that some critics who do not want a separate *Yhteisö* say that, even as it is possible to include it in *Yhteisö*, it is possible to include it in *Alkuperäiset*. The D. E. *Journal* says:

11. *Wang, J. and J. Zhang. 2003. "The Impact of the Internet on the Chinese Economy." *Journal of International Trade and Development* 14(1): 1-15.*

The reply to this is obvious as to the argument which sought to include *Utata* in *Vita*. Just as *Utata* is a very prominent accessory of *Utrix*, *Jagpal* also is. The *Madhe Jagpal* may be a prominent *Vaidhokra*, but *Utrix* is not *Incristomata*. The *Lacuna* were:

<sup>10</sup> 'आदिशब्देन विमलपुत्रमन्त्रात्मकं श्रीपद्मेन्द्रमणिं ज्ञायते ।  
युः शब्दः प्रभिलाषिणीं भवति, न तु आदिशब्देनेति ।' इ. १७७

The *Abhinavabhāratī* says :

“ केवलं यथा विदुषाम्पि श्रीकृष्णस्य, लक्ष्मीनेत्यपि वा ‘विदुषाम्पि-  
लक्ष्मः’ इति, यथा च गौरी लोचनस्य, यथा च वसन्तलक्ष्मीमयालक्ष्म्यलक्ष्मी  
मिलितुमित्यस्यापि स्तम्भितलक्ष्मीनेत्यपि लक्ष्म्यलक्ष्म्यलक्ष्मी यथा लक्ष्मी लक्ष्म-  
न्याम्ना, सर्वेभ्यः समपठितलक्ष्मस्य । ” p. 335.

Another interesting view is that which holds the first  
Sahitya, *Rasa*, itself as the Sahitya of *Sthāna*  
in *Rasa*. This view also arose out of the  
necessity to choose one of the Sahityas  
mentioned by Bharata himself as the Sahitya of *Sthāna* also.  
This view also makes a fine approach to *Sthāna* and is an  
approximation of an aspect of the fundamental nature of *Sthāna*.  
Truth whose realisation is salvation is of the nature of *Sthāna*  
which is *Roman*. It has to be realised by placing the end of  
things which are ‘*Antarman*’ and which show the *Roman*.  
Things *Antarman* must be looked and the looking of *Antar-  
man* led to the *Jagatman*-view. The *Rasa* view is closely  
related to the *Jagatman*-view for when ‘*Antarman*’ is realised,  
*Roman* has to be loved. The love of *Roman*, *Romanas*, is the  
Sahitya of *Sthāna*. When one realises *Roman* everywhere, his  
Love finds the universe; *Jagatman* then flies away, for there  
is none besides or beyond *Roman* to be chosen than...

सद्यः सर्वमपि यदापि वासनीयानुसृतमपि :

लक्ष्मीनेत्युपाख्यानं यतो न विदुषुष्यते ॥

Like *Pradhāna Jagatman*, this is *Pradhāna Rasa*, a superior  
Love, distinct from the *Rasa* of man for women. Bhāṣa  
permeated this idea of *Romanas* and landed on the philosophical  
nature of the *Pradhāna* theory of the *Rasa*.

इति तत्र न लक्ष्मीपदमा लक्ष्म्यलक्ष्मी. । ३५. Pm.

The Abhinavabharati records the Rati very thus :

एव महादत्तामृतममृतमिव रतिर्य योऽप्यमरमिति त्वेव  
कथ्यते स्वमिति । अथेवम्—

‘महादत्तामृतं महादत्तामृतम् अमरम् ।

महादत्तेन च महादत्तः एव कार्यं च विभक्तिः ।’ इति (म. टीका.)

Abhin. Bhā., Gauh. Edn., I, p. 315.

Further, Rati has this additional qualification for being the Sādhya of Śhiva, since the final state of Mukta is one of Śānanda, and Śhā which is realized is itself of the form of Śānanda.

This Rati exists in the same form as Uddha and Jagatpā. Only it seems to be more intimate to Śhiva, a Symbolization of greater importance. Not only Śānanda-eva, but Rati for a personal God, which is called Śhakti and is proposed as a separate Kṛmā, comes under Śhiva. The Śhiva has had a love-treatment at the hands of some poets and dramatists.

‘एव एव विभक्तिविभक्तिर्वा भविष्यते स्वमितिमुद्रुतामृत-  
वर्तिर्य अमरमिति च कथ्यते कृष्णलोकेन एवम् ।’

Abhin. Bhā., Gauh. Edn., I, p. 316.

On the same grounds on which Uddha, Jagatpā and Kṛmā were proposed, the other Sādhya can also be

31. Any one of the remaining Sādhya.

proposed as Sādhya of Śhiva. Only they have to be shown of their ordinary Vādhya, etc., and made a superior and extra-ordinary reality (Purātāt) with Vādhya like Śhiva, etc.

Any one of these eight Purātāt Sādhya can be called the Sādhya of Śhiva. Abhinava says :

“कथ्यते कथ्यते एवमेव एवमपि विभक्तिविभक्तिर्य एवम् । ए  
एव विभक्तिविभक्तिर्य (अमर) कृष्णलोकेन विभक्तिविभक्तिर्य  
एव एवम् । इति एवमेव एव एव कथ्यते एवम् ।”



produce laughter in those who know the real value of the things of the world. To the Yogin, man's action and sentiment appear as Karma-Bhāsa and Dhīva-Bhāsa. Says Bhagya Bhāṣya in a fine verse:

एतन्मम पुत्रोऽयं विदुः कर्मविशेषो ह्ययं वाक्यम्  
 कर्मकामद्विधिर्ममैव न यतः कुलेऽप्युत्तमसि ।  
 ननु दुःखमनसहितमपि विनाशोऽप्ययं कर्मैः  
 कुलेऽपि न तौ दुःखदुर्गतिं विदुः नान्यं दुःखम् ॥

So much on behalf of the importance of Dharma in Śānta.

It is not a, then, less that divides comedy from tragedy. To the looking man, the same world is a tragedy. The Yogin pities the poor Śamāna, caught in the whirlpool of passion. Thus Śānta seems to dominate in Śānta. The seeking Yogin, the Yuktānna, who strives towards his goal, considers the world and its temptations as his enemy; he gets angry at them and desires to do away with them. This attitude is Krodha and Raḍra. The same attitude begets fear of the temptations from which the seeker desires to fly. This is Bhaya. He reads of or listens to an exposition of the great names, the omnipotence, omnipresence, Immutability and other aspects of the nature of the Self and when he contemplates on this wonderful truth about his own Self, he is thrilled and struck with the wisdom of the world of the Spirit. This is Vismaya. As explained already, he neither sees the so-called pleasures of the world and then Jagatāḥ forms the prominent attitude. In this manner, these seven Śāntya can claim to be the Śāntya of Śānta.

The very possibility of each or all of the eight Śāntyas being the Śāntya of Śānta prevents any one of them being the so-called Śāntya of Śānta. It cannot also be held that,

according to circumstances, the Sāhitya-vāda in *Śloka*. A multi-sāhityarūpa Rasa is foreign to the theory of Rasa and is an impossibility. Many Sāhityas can only mean many Rasas. If by virtue of the unity of the object, viz., *Alakṣya*, a plurality of Sāhityas is accepted as resulting only in one Rasa, it can be pointed out that in view of both *Vina* and *Rasāda* resulting in the same end of the destruction of the enemy, *Vina* and *Rasāda* can be made *one and the same Rasa*. Therefore, neither any one nor all of the eight Sāhityas can be put forward as the Sāhitya of *Śloka*.

The real significance of this view however lies in another direction. It points to the fact that any or all of the other Sāhityas become, in their various varieties, *Vyabhidhāna* of *Śloka* and in their ordinary varieties the causes of *Śloka*. One may pass to *Śloka* from *Rasā* or *Śloka*, as a result of broken love, or the death of a beloved person, one may seek solace in *Śloka*. *Arāda* fought the *Rājā* and passed from *Vina* to *Śloka*. Therefore any of the eight Rasas or all of them can be the *Vyabhidhāna* of *Śloka*. Therefore it is that *Śāntadharma*, says: *Śloka* is present in all the Rasas.

एवः सर्वोपनिबन्धितोऽप्युपनिबन्धितोऽपि । *S. R.*, VII, 23, 3333

and *Kaṭhaka* comments upon this

‘*व्यापकं—सर्वेभ्यः पञ्चरात्रिभ्यः पञ्चभ्यः सर्वेभ्यः संनम्य लक्षणमुक्त्वा एव पुनरपि व्यापकत्वात्पञ्चरात्रिभ्यः पञ्चभ्यः एव लक्षणं इति लक्षणसम्बन्धनात्, एवमेव सर्वोपेति पण्डितम् इति ।*’

The next view is a reply to the criticism of the above-

11. All the eight  
Sāhityas together

given view which proposed any one of the

eight Sāhityas as the Sāhitya of *Śloka*.

This view suggests that all the eight can be

considered as constituting together the Śākhya, taking Śhāla as a peculiar case.

“कवे इत्येति ।” *Abh. Bhā., Gauh. Edn., I, p. 209*

“कवे तु वानवराजम्, कविद्वयं तदाः कवे एव वानवराजोऽयं  
कवयिण इत्यतः । विष्णुविष्णुपुत्रद्वयम्, कव्येनैव च कविपुत्र  
कवयिण च कवेद्वयम् ।” *Ibid., p. 212.*

It is true that as Pārasakya, the whole of this complex world is involved in Śhāla; but all these form only Vyākhyāna. Says Abhinava:

“तत्त्वज्ञानसङ्गमस्य च कवयिणः कव्येनैव जैमिनिपौत्रिकविश्व-  
पुत्रिकतयोः कविकविद्वयमेति ।” *Ibid., p. 218.*

Even, in developed form one and only one Śākhya; if many Śhālas appear, they can do so only as Vyākhyāna. The analogy of Pārasakya must not be brought here. These Śhālas contradict each other and cannot co-exist at the same time. How could they function together to produce a common Śāla?

So, what is the real Śākhya of Śhāla? Abhinava holds that Tattvasūtra or Ānandasūtra, itself is the Śākhya of Śhāla. He briefly states it thus in his Abhinavabhāṣā:

“कव्येनैव कवयिः । कवयो—एव कव्यज्ञानमेव कव्येनैवज्ञानम-  
भिति कव्येनैव येनैव कवयिषा तुष्टाः । कव्यद्वये च एव आनन्दज्ञानमेव ।”

“एव कव्यमेव ज्ञानमन्वयिषिद्वयमभेदो योऽप्यनन्वयिषोऽप्य-  
भेदविज्ञेयः कवयौ ।” *Gauh. Edn., I, p. 217.*



Haribhāṭ also he says :

“**॥१॥ विमलमयस्वरूपिणर्महोदधिरिन्द्रियवर्णमयौ दीपकः  
ब्रह्म । तत्र साक्षरमेवैव तत्त्वमित्युक्तम् ।**” *Ibid.* p. 209.

Transparency or knowledge of Akasa is the direct cause or is itself Akasa. Therefore Anupama is the very nature of the Soul or Self which is itself of the form of Knowledge and Ether—Jñāna and Ākasha—in the Sūktic. The Akasa is Sūktic not in the same sense in which Kati, etc. are ; it is Sūktic *par excellence*. It is the base and the root of all other Sūktic. It is upon the sublimation of the ultimate Sūktic that, as a result of sense-contacts with external objects of the world, the other eight Sūktic are created. Behind Kati, Ilāsa, etc. is the eternal Akasa. Kati and other Sūktic rise and fall but Akasa is Sūktic-stay ; Kati and the other Sūktic become its Vyākṛtānta. (*Abhi. Bhā.* p. 137)

Therefore it is, says Kāśikā, that Bhāṭia mentions not this Akasa stay and its Sūktic, Akasa. For, it belongs to a higher plane and it would have been improper if Bhāṭia had given it among Kati and the rest. It is the very basis of Kati, etc. which are not possible without it. Hence there is no need to specially mention what is understood implied.

**यत्र यत्र पुनस्तत्र यत्रात्र न पुनः ।** *Abhi. Bhā.* , I, p. 137.

Shree Gopāla adds that Bhāṭia obtained form mistaking the Vidyānta, etc. of Ilāsa, not because he did not accept this Kati, but because of its super-sensuous nature.

“**विमलमयस्वरूपं तत्र तत्पुनस्तत्रा दीपकमपिब्रह्मणम् ।**”

T. S. S., Edn. K. par. ११६, p. 139.

This answers also the objection that one should not go beyond the total number of the Śākyas which is given by Bharata as forty-seven. Abhinava says that the majority of the number "40" is protected and that Bharata treats of Śākyas by extension, by his eloquent silence.

“तेन भाष्येन कालावधारितेषुद्वयोर्दोषौ परिकल्पितौनयेत्येव-  
द्वितीयोक्तः सत्यम् । न त्वस्य स्वाधिकारा स्वाधिकारं वचनोक्तम् । कालावधौ  
हि कालावधानावधौसप्तकोलसप्तदशभिर्भाष्यैरनुवचनम् । स्वहितकालम् प्रापे-  
त्तिसप्ततया स्वाधिकारावधिकारंयथा स्वाधिकारं ज्ञानमेव । तस्यकालं तु  
सप्ततयावधानावधिकारंयथास्वौ स्वहितानिभ्यः स्वाधिकारं सर्वं स्वाधिकाराः  
विस्तृतौ स्वाधिकारास्त्रिंशत्तन्मन् विस्तृतं एव विस्तृतानिभ्यस्वविधिं एव  
वचनोक्तम् । अत एव द्वयोस्तय तस्या न दुष्ता । न हि कालावधानोर्दोषौ  
कोलविधिं सत्यम् । तेन कालावधानावधाना कालावधानमेव ।”

*Abh. Bhā. Guṇ. Bān. I, p. 337.*

As the permanent wall upon which Rāṭi, etc. are formed, *Āraṇya*, the supreme Śākyas, is necessarily implied. This meaning by silence means not only its acceptance but its acceptance as the greatest Rāṭi.

Another reason why Bharata has not mentioned Śākyas along with Rāṭi, etc. is the difference between *Āraṇya* and other Śākyas. *Āraṇya* is not related by the same means as is the same manner as other Śākyas. Since *Āraṇya* type is usually seen as fitted by Rāṭi, etc., the ordinary means of comprehension which comprehend Rāṭi, etc. do not comprehend the *Āraṇya* type. Further Bharata never attempted to give all the possible Śākyas. He gave only those Śākyas which are also Vyākhyāṭas, hence it is that he chose them all together and speaks of them as the forty-seven Śākyas

That *Sahitya*, *Rasaprakāśa*, which is never a *Vyākhyāna* anywhere, is not mentioned at all by him. How could he, knowing as he did, its real nature?

All the above-given ingenuity and stunts are the miserable verbiage of the greatest method of commenting which never dares to go against the basic text and introduced new things only by securing for it the sanction of the basic text. The facts about the *Rasa* of *Śhanta* stand which we gather from this discussion are—

1. *Tarāṅghīna*, or *Śrāṅghīna* or *Rasavāṅghīna* or briefly the *Rasana* itself is the *Sahitya* of *Śhanta*.

2. It is like the wall; upon it are formed *Rasa*, etc. which are 'Uplifted' of the pure self-blissed Spirit. Nourishment of the purest, unadorned and unstained Spirit by the appropriate *Vibhāva*, etc. will give the *Śhanta* *Rasa*.

3. Though *Rati* etc. are *Sahitya* compared to *Nirveda* etc., they are *Vyākhyāna* compared to the *Rasavāṅghīna*, which is *Sahitya*.

“एव एतत् सारमयम् अतिवर्णितं, यन्मया, श्री-  
विद्याधरम्, वर्णितम् । एव सारमयम् ।”

✓ This *Rasavāṅghīna* is called *Śhanta*!

<sup>1</sup> Though *Abhinava* holds *Śhanta* which is identical with *Rasavāṅghīna* as a *Sahitya* for all time, the anonymous comment<sup>1</sup> lay on the *Vyākhyāna* holds *Śhanta* as appearing in the form of *Vyākhyāna* also in *Sahitya*.

“एतच्छ्री-वर्णितं एव ; एव श्रीविद्याधरः, एवम्  
वर्णितं, एवम् सारमयम्  
एवम् श्रीविद्याधरः वर्णितम् ।” T. S. S., Ed., pp. 12-13.

*Paṇḍita*, also, who already follows *Abhinava*, considers *Śhanta* as a *Vyākhyāna* also. Perhaps *Abhinava* will reply to this

Abhinava advanced the above-given arguments for Shiva and the Śaivism without resorting to the text of Shiva on Shiva found in some recensions. In this text, Shiva is given as the Śaivism of Shiva.

एव शम्भो नमः सुखमविनाशकः ॥३॥

Abhinava has said that Shiva is only another name for Anantashiva. When one speaks of Shiva, or Narada both of which are Caturvritta, one has to qualify them as a special and superior kind to make them the Śaivism of Shiva. This qualification is unnecessary when Anantashiva is accepted as the Śaivism. Ratn var which constitutes the Anantashiva represents the detached or Vyatishiva state of the Citta. The pure nature of the Spirit is like the white thread on which are hung coloured stones at intervals. By constant meditation and effort, the pure light within is seen. It is a state of bliss in a double degree, as Rastavrita and as the Lantide of the real Anantashiva which is Anantashiva.

The text on Shiva found in some recensions describes Shiva as the Prakṛti and Ratn and other Shivas as the Vāmana. The latter rise and fall, appear and disappear on the Anantashiva. They merge in it.

न नमः दुर्लभं न दुर्लभं न द्विषे नमि नमः ।  
 एव शम्भो नमः न नमः नमिषे नमः ॥  
 नमः विनाशकः नमः नमः नमः नमः ।  
 विनाशकः नमः नमः नमः नमः ॥

Just as there are two different Naradas, two different Tattvas (Shiva), there are two Shivas. The Narada illustrated by the verse एव शम्भो नमः, is only a Shiva; it cannot be Tattvasatva or Narada, which Shiva is held by some as Śaivism. See Aṣṭa. Bhā., pp. 103-4 and 115. Similar is shown in the Vyatishiva Shiva.

एवं नो विविद्वज्ज्ञानं वाचसाङ्गम नमो ॥  
 पुनर्विदितव्यमेव वाचसाङ्गमनमो ॥

Therefore it is that Bharata, says Abhinava, treated of Rāsa as the head of all the Rāsas. Further the whole of all Rāsas is Alambita, shorn of all mundane associations, and hence Pīthajyēṣṭha. The idea realised is also so Bhāvanāvidya which is Ānandabīja. Jaganātha perceived this has said that Rāsa is the manifestation of the light of Ānanda itself when the obscuring darkness falls away. Poetry and Drama remove the here and Ānanda manifests itself.

<sup>1</sup> "सङ्गतं सङ्गतसङ्गितवर्तितं नान्यथा ननु नः ।"

Rasapīthakam, p. 53.

# THE TEXT OF THE ABHINAVASHRUTI OF THE CĪṬA SĀRA

IN this section, I am presenting the text of the Abhinavashruti on the Cīṭa Sāra. It would have been unnecessary to give this text here, if the text available in the Gaudvard Edition had not been so over-ridden. The text presented here by me is as corrected with the help of Professor M. S. Kappaswami Sastrin. I give in the foot-notes the incorrect readings found in the MS. in the Madras Government Oriental MSS. Library with the letter 'M', and in the Gaudvard Edition with the letter 'G'. There are still a few passages of which completely satisfactory reconstruction has not been possible. Pandit B. Sanku Aiyangar of the Sanskrit Department of the Madras University placed at my disposal the readings in two MSS. of the Abhinavashruti from Māngla Kod, which belong to H. H. the Jyoti of Madras. Some of the readings in these two Māngla MSS. supported our reconstructions while many agreed with those found in the Gaud. Edition. Two of the Māngla readings were definitely helpful and these are given, besides a few others, in the foot-notes with the letters 'A', 'B', 'C'.

<sup>1</sup> Patil, Māngla Sāra, Gaud. Edn., Vol. I, pp. 143-51.

It is well known that Hemacandra, who expounded whole sections from *Alimara*, helps us a good deal in the task of reconstructing the text of the *Alimaraśāstra*. The *Śāstra* from section in the *Alimaraśāstra* is to be found, with the omission of some parts, on p. 85 (first and second), pp. 85-87 (first) and p. 86 (first) of Hemacandra's *Śrīpāṇḍita*. As pointed out in the foot-note, Hemacandra supports the two Māṅgla readings selected by me, towards the close of the section.

### अधिनियमः

#### सामान्यप्रकरणम्

ये तुल्ये एव इति याज्ञि, एते सामान्यप्रकरणे ।  
 एव केचिदपि—एतत् सामान्यप्रकरणम् एतन्मोक्षोपनिषद्भिः  
 विधायकम् । एव सामान्यप्रकरणेऽपि तुल्येऽपि । अधिनियमः  
 इति विधायकम् ॥

एतन्मोक्षोपनिषद्भिः अधिनियमः, एतन्मोक्षोपनिषद्भिः  
 इति सामान्यप्रकरणम् । विधायकम् एतन्मोक्षोपनिषद्भिः  
 सामान्यप्रकरणम् इति तुल्यम् । एतन्मोक्षोपनिषद्भिः न सामान्य  
 'सामान्यप्रकरणम्' । एतन्मोक्षोपनिषद्भिः 'सामान्यप्रकरणम्' इति चेत् 'सामान्यप्रकरणम्'  
 इति चेत् 'सामान्यप्रकरणम्' इति चेत् 'सामान्यप्रकरणम्' इति चेत् 'सामान्यप्रकरणम्' ॥

<sup>1</sup> M. and G. *Alimara* p. 85.

<sup>2</sup> M. *Alimara*.

<sup>3</sup> M. *Śrīpāṇḍita*.

<sup>4</sup> G. *Śrīpāṇḍita*.

‘पुत्रावस्यतेऽपि नानुभवः, वाचाद्विषयानुभवे, अज्ञानत्वात्, अतो-  
नानुव्याप्तिरस्य; न हि वेदावगुह्यः अतोन्वयेः। तुल्योदाहरणेऽपि  
हि, हि आहोन्मृगपतनपुत्रमन्विनि।’ वेदाहोन्मृगपतनो’। वृत्ति-  
मन्विनि वाहोन्मृगपतनः’ एवं वाच्ये एवाह, न आहोन्मृगपतनो  
अन्वयानुवादे ‘पुत्रावस्यते’ विधेः। ‘ये नानुभवोऽपि नानुभवो  
एव’ अन्वयानुवादे ‘अन्वयानुवादे, अतो नानुभवोऽपि नानुभवो  
एव’ इति ।

[illegible]

1000

100

100

■ **What's the deal with the "new" *Star Trek*?**

© 2004 Blackwell Publishing Ltd *Journal of Internal Medicine* 255: 103–110

100

<sup>a</sup> Reported as the residual on both the 1000 and 100000 scale.

100







कालकुलशैली; ललहावादि शेष, य तु तान् इत्यादि विविक्तैः, विविक्तैश्च शेष इति । 'वैराग्यस्य चतुर्विधम्' (टी. क. साङ्ख्यकारणिका— १५) इति हि लक्ष्यम् । यत्तु ललहादिभिः सर्वैश्च शब्दैर् वैराग्यं व्यक्तम् । ललहादि-  
लक्षणम्—'ललत्तुं पुनःपुनर्ललत्तुमैव' (शेषसूत्रम्— १, १३) इति ।  
अन्येषाम्, 'ललत्तुं तु वैराग्यं हान्येति यदा यादा' इति पुनश्चलितुमैव<sup>१</sup>  
कालान्तरादिभिः । ललहा ललहादल्लेखं ललहापञ्चालम् नमिरेत्यपञ्चाल-  
विधिः यः विहितः सत्यपी, किन्तु ललहाशब्देन स्वाधी भवेत् । यत्तु लल-  
हादिपञ्चालपञ्चालो कालो ललहापञ्चालविधौललहापञ्चालोपलक्षितस्यैव  
पञ्चालपञ्चालम्, यत्—

इहा पुनोऽप्यनुपपन्नं ललहापञ्चालं वीरिणि वा  
नमिरेत्तु सन्ती पुनरिनिधिः कालपञ्चालः ।  
इहा वैराग्या विचरन्निधौ कालपञ्चालो  
यदा सृष्टेः सा पुनःपुनरुपपन्नं कालम् ॥

इति ललितेयस्य शेषसूत्रम् 'विशेषादेव ; यत्तु सर्वं कालम्' ।

यत्तु विचारादल्लक्षणे विचारात् ललहापञ्चालं कालपञ्चालं तु काल-  
पञ्चालेन ललहापञ्चाली, अथवा हि विचारादल्लक्षणात् ललहापञ्चालं  
वैराग्यात् शेषसूत्रपञ्चालम् कालपञ्चालम् । यत्तु तत्र हि, 'यत्तु वैराग्यं  
विहितम्' यः कालम् । विहिते हि शेषसूत्रपञ्चालपञ्चालविचारादिभिः ।  
वैराग्यं तु पञ्चालीना सर्वैः । यत्तु वा वैराग्येन विहितम् । ललहापञ्चाल

<sup>१</sup> Not by Patañjali, but by Vyāsa in the *Philosophy* (Ananta-  
bhāṣya Tika, p. 29)

<sup>२</sup> This is used as evidence in one of the two chapters MSS. Both B and G have विचरन्निधौ. Haraschandra also reads only विचरन्निधौ. (p. 21, E. Asia 1921)

<sup>३</sup> B and G— कालपञ्चालम्.







[illegible]

<sup>1</sup> *See* also C. G. S. *et al.* (1999).

• **Wendell** **and** **Oliver** **renewed** **friendship**

100

**Welding Technology**

1994

© 2004 Blackwell Publishing Ltd

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO



**Abstract**

 Springer

**Figure 1**

■ **18. 1999年10月1日起，凡在我国境内销售货物的单位和个人，均应按销售额征收增值税。**











अथानुलि शब्दो यः । अथ च भिन्नानुक्रमेणु 'स्ववि-  
वादीन्, शब्दोपयोगिनाम्' इत्यन्तरं शब्दो यः अन्तर्भावविशेषात्तत्र  
इत्यनियन्तवत्त्वम् यतो । अथ सर्वशब्दो ज्ञानाद्यत्र पञ्चमशब्दः<sup>१</sup>, नि-  
वेद्यो निवृत्तिना । अथानुपपत्त्या<sup>२</sup> केनोपपत्त्याप्युपपत्तिरिति ।  
अथ सर्वशब्दविशेषात्तत्र पूर्ववन्निबन्धः । अथ च इत्यन्तु इत्यन्तु का-  
दाचित् च अन्तर्भावेति कदाचित् इत्यन्तु 'शेषः । शब्दान्तर्भावेति तु निवे-  
द्येन पूर्वमेव सर्ववन्निवृत्तिरिति स्वविशेषात्तत्राविशेषात्तत्रानुपपत्तिरिति-  
विशेषात्तत्र च इत्यन्तु यः । इतिानुपपत्त्याविशेषात्तत्रोपपत्तिरिति च अथ यतो-  
मुपपत्तेः, अन्तर्भावविशेषात्तत्रोपपत्तिरिति । अथ शेषम्—

“अथानुलि देवतां शब्दादीन्, यद्यपि ।

यतो च देवदेवता शब्दो यः यद्यपि ॥”

अथ च केचनदेवतादीनामप्येति विवक्षा । अथ हि देवदेवतादीनिहोपपत्तेः ।  
देवताशब्दविशेषात्तत्रोपपत्तिरिति । निवेद्यविशेषात्तत्रोपपत्तिरिति अन्तर्भावेति ।  
अथ यः अन्तर्भावविशेषात्तत्रोपपत्तिरिति यद्यपि देवदेवतादीनामप्युपपत्तिरिति अन्तर्भा-  
वेति विवक्षा । अथ च इत्यन्तु यः । अथ अन्तर्भावविशेषात्—

देवताशब्दविशेषात्तत्रोपपत्तिरितिहोपपत्तिरिति ।

निवेद्यविशेषात्तत्रोपपत्तिरितिहोपपत्तिरिति ।

निवेद्यविशेषात्तत्रोपपत्तिरितिहोपपत्तिरितिहोपपत्तिरिति ।

<sup>१</sup> There is a ३ before the M. and G.

<sup>२</sup> M. and G. अनुपपत्तिः.

<sup>३</sup> M. अनुपपत्तिः.

<sup>४</sup> M. अन्तर्भावविशेषात्तत्रोपपत्तिरिति ; G. अन्तर्भावविशेषात्तत्रोपपत्तिरिति.

एवं एवं विविक्तवाच्यं वाच्यमुदाहरते ततः ।

सुप्रतिविद्यमाने तु वाच्य एव कथ्यते ॥

सुप्रतिविद्यमाना वाच्यमुदाहरतेतत् ॥

अतः किमे दृश्यत्पुनरावर्तिरित्येव बहुलत्वं न कथ्यते, कथं न वाच्यः ।  
 'दीक्षावाच्यमर्थेति' (M. and G. 123) इति भाषित्वा सङ्क्षेपेन दीक्षकमपि  
 वाच्यत्वेन वदितव्यत्वं वाच्यत्वं सम्भाव्यते न, किं निमित्तम् । वाच्य-  
 कथने तु दीक्षावाच्यमर्थेतिरित्येव किं व्यवस्थेनं पुनरावृत्त्यर्थं  
 बहुलमुक्त इति कुतश्चि भाषितव्यम्<sup>१</sup> । अतः कालवीर्यान्वयवाच्यवाच्य-  
 कथने चार्थेन व्यवस्थेयम् । किञ्च, 'वाच्यवाच्यदीक्षितव्यम्'<sup>२</sup> इत्यनेनैव  
 वक्ष्यामात् । कथं तु वाच्यत्वेन सुप्रतिविद्य' सङ्क्षेपेन कथ्यतेतत् ।  
 तेन विवक्ष्यमानं बहुलं वाच्यत्वं च दृश्यते सिद्धम् । पुनरावृत्त्यर्थ-  
 वाच्यः सम्भाव्य एव । अतः न दृश्य इति कथं न कथ्यतेतत् । पुनः,  
 यदावात् । सर्वज्ञानात् किञ्चिदर्थं कथितव्यमित्यान्वयमुचितव्यक्तं तद्वति-  
 कथितं तेन<sup>३</sup> । 'अतस्मिन् वाच्यमर्थेति' इति । 'अतस्मिन् किं  
 दृश्यवत्तत्' । किञ्चनेन वाच्यं वीक्ष्यमर्थम् । अतः पुनरावृत्त्यर्थं यदा-  
 किञ्चिदर्थमित्यान्वयमुचितम्<sup>४</sup> । अतस्मिन् वाच्यत्वं सर्वज्ञानात्पदिति-  
 कथ्यमानत्वं चोक्तमर्थेति वाच्यमित्याहतेन ॥

<sup>१</sup> M. and G. 123 वाच्यम्

<sup>२</sup> M. and G. 123 इति,

<sup>३</sup> M. and G. 123 न

<sup>४</sup> M. and G. 123 इति

<sup>५</sup> G. 123 इति,

<sup>६</sup> M. and G. 123 इति

<sup>७</sup> G. 123 इति,



<sup>2</sup> Mr. Thompson, Phagolaryn, on his return (on his side) of the Mountain Mountains of Karakoram. Confronted in the Vardana, Korymbos Society Series, says that some Aksharids, following the Pika of the and the Vardana of the, had been to the sea in number.

<sup>10</sup> „Das war nicht unser Fehler“, argumentierte Hoffmannsperger noch.

The basis of this statement is not given, and I have not been able to find the *Abendblatt* (see) who held Weiss to be true.

“ एवं सख्यारम्भो वैराग्यवृत्तिरनुपमः । ”

The same found, no follower, since Vātsīya's view of Bhāva-kīrya and Rāsa-kīrya and his view of Bhāva or Rāsa being influenced by their own samasamānā with cārasamā. The older Pūya of Bhāvaśā and Dāśin as speech expressive of non-sexual love developed into a new Rāsa. Dāśin says that the Pūya is very closely related to Bhāgīya but is distinct, since Pūya is the Bhāgīya of the former whereas Rāsa is the Bhāgīya of Bhāgīya.

सख्यं वीर्यवृत्तिरिति वदन्ति शङ्कराचार्यः ।

Dāśin, II, 215.

Friendship or Affection of parents—Sūtra and Vātsīya—leaves in some of the noblest poetry and there was felt a necessity to recognize a Rāsa for such situations. Rāsaśā who introduces Pūya at first, mentions Sūtra as its Bhāgīya—सख्यवृत्तिरिति । That Rāsaśā thought mainly of Friendship is shown not only by the Bhāgīya but also by the following explanation—

सख्येति वदन्ति शङ्कराचार्यः । XVI, 18.

We now get three categories of non-sexual attachment or affection,—(i) the Pūya of Rāsaśā with Sūtra as its Bhāgīya which comes to friendship, (ii) Vātsīya or the affection of parents and akin for children and youngsters<sup>1</sup> and (iii) Pūya,

<sup>1</sup> Vātsīyaśā calls the Vātsīya, describes it as parental affection and gives it as his S. D. after giving the 8 old Rāsa and the Bhāva, the 1st.

<sup>2</sup> सख्यं वीर्यवृत्तिरिति वदन्ति—

<sup>3</sup> सख्यं वीर्यवृत्तिरिति वदन्ति ॥ १८ ॥

सख्यं वीर्यवृत्तिरिति वदन्ति ॥ १८ ॥

the other kinds of attachment like that between a leader and a follower, a king and his officer or court-pose. To these is to be added the fourth, *Ishah*,<sup>2</sup> reverence to others and devotion to God.

All these aspects, to begin with, were called only *Prepas* which then was understood as all types of non-university level

[illegible]

Dezobry's *Preparat*, as has two illustrations above, refer only to the fourth aspect called *Hekto*. He actually calls it by the same *Hekto* and uses it as a synonym. *Foto*. Commentators

aparte din funcționarea  
administrativă și  
organizarea unor activități  
educative și  
culturale în scopuri  
școlare și extrașcolare.

The discussion given in Ruppel's childhood and Helge's *Wander* (B. V III). The *Manuscript*—concerning the history of the *Wander*—as the history of the *Wander*.

© 2007 by The McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.

Evangelicalism continues, via Christian Village, with David's love for John Knox, great Menzies as its subject.

© 2004 Blackwell Publishing Ltd *Journal of Internal Medicine* 255: 105–112

<sup>1</sup> *Macrorhynchus clausus* Linn also sexual love—*Stegomyia* Felt, *Stictia*, *Stictia* and *Stictia*. The last is the *Stictia* of *Stictia*. "on other"

"...  
"

A. R. C. Thompson, Ed., p. 194.



as Valmiki's words spoken on Rama's arrival at his house, *Dhages* says:

इत्यहं तुभे भिक्षुते सन्मत्सरासीं वृष्टिः ।

बहिष्कृतसन्मत्सरास्यः सुपीडय गच्छे वृष्टिः ॥ X. 3, 12, 273

The other instance is the manifestation of a king's devotion to Śiva, uttered in the form of a Śloka on seeing Him:

वृष्टिं वासुदेवे मेने गच्छे सद्यःसमीपम् ।

बहिष्कृतसन्मत्सरास्यं यत्र मेव इत्यसन्मत्सरात् ॥ II, 278.

It is quite natural that in our literature, Bhakti should have come in as a dominant word and that scholars should have accepted it as a distinct Rasa. Though Kāśhika mentions only the *Treyas* of Bhakti, we find the *Abhinavāśhikarī* saying that others propose not only Bhakti but *Śraddhā*, *Pūjā*, also as a new Rasa. *Abhinava*, however, does not consider them as distinct Rasas but includes them in *Śhānta* of which the two are important accessories.

“यत्र तु इत्यवशिष्टमस्ति ते बहिष्कृते सन्मत्सरीकृतसन्मत्सरास्य-  
वृष्टौ समीपं गच्छ (सम्पन्नम्) वृष्टिं यं गच्छेः सुखसमीपं यत्नम् ॥”

*Abh. Shā., I. Ch. VI, p. 348.*

Of Bhakti, more will be said in the section on Madhura Rasa. The *Dhvanyāloka* mentions *Pūjā* and Bhakti separately as *Bhāva* and includes them in *Rāga*, *Viśāda* or some other similar *Bhāva*. (IV, 41)

<sup>1</sup> Kāśhikāśhī, reproduces this description as the additional Rasas from the *Abh. Shā.* See E. A., p. 44, Text and Com. *Śhānta*'s *Abhinavāśhikarī* seems to be another work which speaks of the *Yuddhā* Rasa and includes it in one of the nine accepted Rasas.

प्रेमिणमवाप्तो वापः . . . . . ।

इतिवद्वदितुं लज्जामन्वयिष्यामि वीरिणि ॥

Priya has many types of love other than Rati and Shakti. To be clear about accepting friendship as Rati, some seem to have called Sacha itself as a Rati. Kuchaka used the name Sacha for the Shikhyas and called the Rati, Priya; but these proposed Sacha as the Rati and Ardhra as the Shikhyas. Kuchaka himself mentioned this Ardhra while describing his Sacha Shikhyas:

वाद्यन्त-वाद्यन्ता स्नेहोदे वदति वीरि । XVI, 18.

The Ardh, Shikhyas introduced and collected the Sacha, was with Ardhra as the Shikhyas.

"वादीनामपिनाः स्नेहो वा इति वापः । स्नेहो वदितः । न च वदुःसाहस्येन वदितवति । तथा हि—वाद्यन्त वाद्यनिपाती वेदो वदितव्यः, वदुःो विजयने वदो, वाद्यन्ते वादी वदीर वद । एवं वदन्त वदवदन्ति वदन्तः ।" *Ardh. Bhā., I, p. 142.*<sup>1</sup>

This Ardhra Priya, Sacha, Vidyas and similar Ratis based on attachment. This is not a commendable attitude.

<sup>1</sup> Haraschandra, K. A. Vyāsa, p. 22.

"वेदो वदितव्यः इति वीरि वीरिणः । वदन्ते वा वापः वीरः न हि । वाद्यन्तः वदो वीरः वदति, नैव वदितव्यः । वाद्यन्तः वाद्यो वीरः वाद्यन्तः । वदन्ते वा वदितः वाद्यन्तः वाद्यन्तः ।"

*Śrībhagavata, Śaṅkhaśaṅkhaśaṅkha, p. 228.*

वदति वीरः तथा वीरः वीरः वीरः वीरः वीरः वीरः ।

वाद्यन्तः वाद्यन्तः वदितव्यः वीरः वीरः ।

वदन्तः, वदितव्यः वीरः वदितव्यः वीरः ।

वदितव्यः वदितव्यः, वदितव्यः वदितव्यः वीरः ।

To have less distinctions is no great aim. If it is said that friendship is only a variety of *Rasa*, can we call the *Rasa* in the association of Kama and Saptar, *Syngita*? If brotherly attachment again is brought under *Rasa*, is the *Rasa* in the association of Kama and Bharata, or Kama and Lakshmana, *Syngita*? If *Dharmatva* can be called forth to deny *Rasatva*, as Lakshmana's attachment to Kama, why should not opponents of *Rasatva* call forth another kind of *Virtu* to deny *Rasatva* to Bharata? Do Advaitins and Homanadvaitins mean that Friendship, Brotherly attachment, Parental affection and the like are only *Illusions* that cannot be converted into a state of *Rasa* with attendant *samantaras*? Lakshmana is only too full of these types of attachment. The instance of Dasaratha's death due to separation from Kama is ample proof for the existence of *Vismalpa*<sup>1</sup> as a major mood, fit to be developed and fit to be related.

### LAUTTA RASA

In the same section, the *Alka. Bhā.* mentions and mentions another *Rasa* called *Lautpa*, of which the *Sāhitya* is

<sup>1</sup> Strangely, we find *Vismalpa* introduced (as a *Rasa*, of course) in the midst of other *Rasas* in the text of *Bharata* itself. In Ch. 18, except section, dealing with *Pāpārasa*, we find with reference to Yagna and Kama:

"*sa prapancha vishaya, dāhanyā vishayaḥ: vishaya-  
vishaya vishayaḥ dāhanyā vishayaḥ*"

E. M. Edm., p. 112

A similar strange passage occurs in Ch. 22, in *Śr. S.*, where also where *Rasa* are mentioned as *śāstra*:

*śāstraḥ saḥ śrī śrī śāstraḥ sa*

But the correct reading here is *śāstraḥ saḥ śrī śrī śāstraḥ sa*

given as *Garbha*. Abhinava suggests that it can be included in *Himsa*, *Rasa* or elsewhere.

एतेन दर्शयामि कथं नैवमस्य कदाचनमेव कल्पितं नान्यत्, इति वा, एतौ वा, नान्यत्र वर्णयामासुः । *Abh. Prak.*, p. 142

Lalaya seems to have been proposed to label the *Rasa* of an actor-king like *Kavya* whose role position for *Śūka* is uncertain. The chief of heart, Abhinava says, is inappropriate: it is not *Rasa* in him, but only *Rasābhāsa*, and the *Anandāśya* of his direct name *Himsa* *Rasa*. *Śrīrāgadeva* summarises Abhinava thus.

अनुकल्पिता कृत्वा रीतिं तदुक्तमस्यस्य ।

#### MIYATS AND ASHA RASAS

Even as Abhinava does, Dharmajaya also refers to other *Rasas* proposed by writers. *Tala* and *Śūka*, two additional *Bhāva*, and their inclusion by Dharmajaya in one or the other of the *Bhāva*, were referred to previously. In the same vein, Dharmajaya refers to two additional *Rasas*, *Miyats* and *Aśpa*, *Śīma* and *Qambhāga*.

दर्शयामासमेव नान्यं कदाचनान्यथैव ।

एतेनान्यदपि कदाचनान्यथैव दर्शितः । *D. R.*, IV, 11.

*Rasa* refers no longer to a mental state only; these writers generally it very much to mean any model or any 'idea.'

If we can infer anything from the mention of these additional *Rasas* by Abhinava after a reference to Lalaya's view that *Rasas* are innumerable, we may say that it was Lalaya who proposed these additional *Rasa*. Though Lalaya's

commentary on the K. S. is not available, we have, about that time, the K. A. of Kashiya, which holds the same view on the number of Rases as Lalla's is held by Abhinava to hold. These writers re-examined Bharata's text to find out what exactly constituted Rases and Bhāvas. Bharata considered as Rases those emotions which were "master"—*śikṣābhāva*, and were consequently attended upon by many minor ones, (*śubhābhāva*) which are called Bhāvas. The forty-one Bhāvas described by him include the eight *śikṣāras* also and these eight are now again described as Bhāvas among Bhāvas. This shows that the eight *śikṣāras* had a *śikṣā*-stage and a *Bhāva*-stage. When rendered by *Vyākṣhāna*, *Ras*, etc., become *śikṣāras*. Similarly, though some writers, other Bhāvas also can be rendered by other attendant Bhāvas and made *śikṣāras*. According to this view, the *Vyākṣhānas* themselves would have other *Vyākṣhānas*; *Śrīras* is attended by *Chit*, *Śrīras* by *Śrīras*, and so on. Says Abhinava:

“.....अभिवादिनामि न अभिवादिने वदति, यथा विदित्त  
विदित्त, यथा विदित्त इत्यादि विदित्तमिति । अत्राह । Ch. VII. p. 346.

Abhinava did not accept this view.<sup>1</sup> But Lalla's and Kashiya's position would make its acceptance necessary for them. Bharata says while explaining what *Rasa* is -

यस्य तस्य वृत्तिः स. अत्राह. । अत्राह. । अत्राह. ।

<sup>1</sup> If it is accepted, this view, it might give a handle to those who considered all the forty-one *Vyākṣhānas* also as capable of becoming *Rases*. In, he says, whenever there comes to occur in our *Vyākṣhāna* many others, as the instance *Vyākṣhāna*, etc. in *Śrīras*, or *Śrīras*, it cannot be said that one *Vyākṣhāna* is attended by others, but it must be said that all these are separately *Vyākṣhānas* attending the same *śikṣāras*, *Vyākṣhāna*, *Ras*.

Kudrja, perhaps based himself on this text when he said that any *Ekiva* can be *Raja*, because *Avasthapatra* or reliability is present in it.

इति कल्पया राजा कर्म ॥ XII, 1.

उपवाहकत्वेन सपुत्रादीनामिदमवधारितं ।

निर्दिष्टमिति लक्षणावधारितं चेति राजा ॥

Only a *putra* must develop the *Vyākṛticāra* due to a state of reliability. Kāśhikā explains Kudrja's clearly and observes that there is no mental state which cannot be called *Raja*, if only it is developed.

"अवधारणे कल्पयत्युक्तं—सपुत्रं वासि वा वासि निवृत्तिं वा पतिमेव राजं न लीयति । अनेन सपुत्रत्वसंज्ञकत्वात्पुत्रेणैव वासित्वं लीयं वा न वा राजं वक्तुं इति ।"

Kudrja was perhaps contemporaneous with Śaṅkha C. 450 A.D. and thus followed Lohapa, C. 425 A.D., on the question of *Raja* being as easy as *Ekiva*. If Bhāṣya

and Bhāṣya does not seem to support the question of *Ekiva*. He seems to allow *Vyākṛticāra* in *Vyākṛticāra*. Defining *Dharma*, the *Ārya* in the H. C. says *साधु-सिद्धि-सुख-सुख*, Ch. VII, 14, p. 36. *Ārya* is *Vyākṛticāra* is given as an *Ekiva* of another *Vyākṛticāra* *Gāra* (p. 36). In *Ārya*, *Ekiva* and *Ekiva* are given, and many other *Vyākṛticāra* also occur here as well as in *Vyākṛti* (p. 36).

On p. 36 of his *Ārya*, Bhāṣya also says etc. and calls it a case of *Ekiva*. He says that the verse perhaps lost part of *Vyākṛticāra* appearing one after another. *Vyākṛti*, *Ārya*, *Ekiva*, *Ekiva*, *Ekiva*, *Ekiva*, and lastly *Ekiva*. He explains however that really *Ekiva* is the *Vyākṛticāra* which we define. This seems to mean that the *Vyākṛticāra* of *Ekiva* has other *Vyākṛticāra*, *Vyākṛti* etc. "अनेन ॥ निवृत्तिं वा वासित्वं लीयं वासित्वं लीयं वासित्वं लीयं ।"

speaks only of eight or nine *Bhāras* or *Rāmas*, it is because of their greater vogue among poets and critics. According to Abhinava, Lallaṭa said the same thing.

“एवमेव न न तां हृदये कृते । तेन ” वाचस्पत्येनैव तस्मिन्  
वर्णितानां एवमेव सर्वेभ्यश्च, इति ननु, बहुविधेन विदितं सर्वोपपा-  
दयमानं ( ) इत्युक्तम् । <sup>12</sup> *Abh. Dh.*, I, p. 295

“तेन वाचस्पत्येनैव तस्मिन् वर्णितानां सर्ववर्णितम् इति वदन्ते-  
(लोकदार्ढ्यमितिर्वा) वचम्, कथमुक्तम् । यथाप्यने वैद्वज्जगते ।”

*Ibid.*, p. 295.

It is perhaps Lallaṭa who, while commenting on the text concerning the *Bhāras*, *Tyāghatāras* etc. at the beginning of Ch. VI, says regarding *Bhāras* that Bhāsa did not give any fixed number for the *Bhāras*; for, Abhinava says in his commentary in this place:

“एवमित्यु न वक्ष्यामि विवेकम् ।” *Ibid.*, p. 295.

Unfortunately, the *Bhāra-Bhāras* of the *Abhinavabharatī* as, for the most part, lost; and Abhinava's detailed statement and admission of Lallaṭa's view was lost to us.

Pratibhābhāṣya, who comes after Jaṇaka, notices this view of Lallaṭa that *Śrīvatsa* and the other *Bhāras* are also *Rāma*. His explanation for many considering only eight or nine as *Rāma* is not very different from Lallaṭa's *Śrīvatsa*-*prasaṅga*. Pratibhābhāṣya takes his stand on *Caturvarga* as contrasted with those objects which are to be avoided by the war—the *Paṇḍitvarga*. Pratibhābhāṣya says that only nine are called *Rāma* because of their relevance to the four *Paṇḍitvargas* and the same *Rāma* as referred to them also is “*Uttama*”, technical and traditional for the *Śāstra*. This is a clumsy





## PRABHU, DEHYA AND OTHER NAMES

The Nityasaptas of Rāmanandā and Govindandā follow Abhinava, reproducing these very words of the Abhinavabhāratī but with that thought, usefulness to Purnastotra and Rāghavānandī Kṛpā to nitya, more Kṛpā as possible : Rādhyā with Gaudhā as its Śāṅkhyā ; Rādhyā with Ānandā as its Śāṅkhyā ; Vyomaśā Kṛpā with Ānandā as its Śāṅkhyā ; Dṛṣṭhā Kṛpā with Ānandā as its Śāṅkhyā and Śāṅkhyā Kṛpā with Śāṅkhyā as its Śāṅkhyā.

कृपयन्ति तयोःति—यदा कृपयन्ती नीत्यः, यदादेवतयोः  
नीत्यः, यदादेवतयोः त्वयन्, यदादेवतयोः दुःखम्, यदादेवतयोः  
दुःखयन्ति ।

G. O. S. edn. p. 161.

According to the view that accepts the Vyākhyānā also as Kṛpā, the names Śāṅkhyā and Vyākhyānā are not fixed names of two acts, but rather names of stages. A Śāṅkhyā may be a Vyākhyānā and a Vyākhyānā may become a Śāṅkhyā. Abhinava himself draws our attention to Bhāṣya postulating the Vyākhyānā Jāyamaśā as Śāṅkhyā. (p. 214, Abh. 214.) This Jāyamaśā is a Śāṅkhyā. The author of the gloss on the Vyākhyānā says :

यदादेवतयोः त्वयन्ति यन्ति : यदा नीत्ययन्तिनीत्ययन्ति,  
यदादेवतयोः, नीत्ययन्ति नीत्ययन्तिनीत्ययन्ति, नीत्ययन्ति नीत्ययन्ति,  
नीत्ययन्ति नीत्ययन्ति, यदादेवतयोः, यदादेवतयोः, यदादेवतयोः,  
यदादेवतयोः नीत्ययन्तिनीत्ययन्ति, यदादेवतयोः नीत्ययन्तिनीत्ययन्ति

T. S. S. Edn. pp. 11-12.

*Śāṅkadeva, Śāṅkadevabhāṣa :*

एकस्य एवमेवाः सृष्टिर्द्विधाभावः ।  
 सृष्टिर्द्विधाभावः एव एवमेव ।  
 एवमेव एव एवमेव एवमेव ।  
 एव एव एव एवमेव एवमेव ।  
 एवमेव एवमेव एवमेव एवमेव ।  
 एवमेव एवमेव एवमेव एवमेव ।

*Śāṅkadeva, Śāṅkadevabhāṣa, १ :*

एवमेव एवमेव एवमेव । एवमेव एवमेव । एवमेव एवमेव-  
 एवमेव । एवमेव एवमेव एवमेव । एवमेव एवमेव । एवमेव एवमेव ।  
 एवमेव एवमेव एवमेव एवमेव ।

Further, we find among the Vyākhyāṣas, Ananta which is only Ananta, the Śūnyas of Ananta, but in a lower degree. Then which is Ananta, the Śūnyas of Ananta ; Ananta which is only Ananta, the Śūnyas of Ananta Ananta.

Ananta is a writer who held the same view as Lalla and Ananta on the number of Ananta. Ananta's theory of Ananta is a very complex problem and it has been approached at length by the present writer in the Ananta section of his Ph. D. thesis on Ananta's Ananta Problem. Ananta is a writer and a philosopher concerned regarding the question of the number of Ananta. Fundamentally, Ananta is only one in Ananta, and that is, Ananta is Ananta or Ananta. Compared to this, even Ananta, Ananta, Ananta, and the other old Ananta are said to be called Ananta, but are only Ananta, much more so the Vyākhyāṣas. But this is a Vyākhyāṣa state ; all affairs and there is a Vyākhyāṣa state also in which, by



Pygmy' in Bhoja, both of which are Kanu from earlier times. The two new Kanu of Bhoja are Udhita and Uddhara Kanu. They are both explained and illustrated on p. 315 of the S. R. L. Man is held as the Sthitya of the Udhita Kanu and Gaura as the Sthitya of the Uddhara Kanu. Bhoja says that the Udhita is also called Ugarava.

It is clear that Bhoja proposed these two new Kanu as a result of his realization that each type of Kanu shall be

<sup>1</sup> [cf. Bhoja gives Pygmy as *Vaidyapada*, i.e. having *Vidyā* as its Sthitya, S. R. L., p. 314. Bhoja's illustration is however not branching but only two for woman which will not give Pygmy as different from Sygma. As a matter of fact, Pygmy is considered by Bhoja as the Kanu lying at the root of Sygma and all other types of Kanu. Pygmy is called *Atyapada*—

'*atyapada* *va* *atyapada* : *atyapada*—

'*atyapada* *va* *atyapada* *va* *atyapada* :

as in *Samasamgraha* ch. 11' (U. R. Gupta, V. II.)

S. R. L., p. 315.

The verse from the U. R. Gupta quoted by Bhoja occurs in the drama to explain the impossible love that two persons, of whatever descriptions they may be, become mutually on seeing each other,—called *Tatkalpana* and *Calpana*. This is a pure and most happy love and runs high on the symbolic side of Bhoja's imaginative mind. Bhoja, as can be seen in the last section of this paper, synthesizes all Kanu and Khana in two Pygmy or Puman. Bhoja, as love for Him, You is love for Charles and so on. In his *Syngma Pradipa*, Ch. XI, Bhoja says at the very end:

*atyapada* *va* *atyapada* :

[1] Dr. Dr. and Dr. Golla evidently use their view of the number of Kanu accepted by Bhoja in *Samasamgraha* *Samasamgraha* *Samasamgraha*.

*atyapada* *va* *atyapada* *va* *atyapada* : p. 123.

Bhoja's synthesis of all Kanu as Puman is to be found in this writer also, at this more later. (See *A. Kanu*, pp. 117-11)

distinguished by a Rasa which determines its character and constitutes its individuality. Thus (Prata is the Rasa of the Dhrubhata, here: Preyas of the Dhrubhata; Uddhata or Uggata of the Dhrubhata and Uddhata of Dhrubhata. He says expressly in his *Slyajata Prastava* :

न च सारसिद्धिं विना, नः सारं केवलम् अहम् सर्वमिदं  
च केवलमवाप्नुते । अमुल्लस्यति सारसालं वीरसाल-वीरसाल-  
वीरसाल-वीरसालमालम् । *Mat. 113, Vol. II, pp. 107-8.*

Among old Sanskrit writers also, as among modern research scholars, few had a correct knowledge of what the king of Dhrubhata actually is. Śaṅkarācārya is the only writer who caught sight of Bhoga's Uddhata and Uddhata Rases and criticised them in his R. A. S., pp. 166-171, T. 5-8. The anonymous *Sāhitya samitā* (T. 5-8, 114), a work largely indebted to Bhoga, also notes Bhoga's Uddhata, Uddhata and Preyas and remarks that some would consider these three Rases as included in the eight. I have dealt with this at length elsewhere.

In addition to these two new Rases, Bhoga, like Śaṅkara, recognised all the Dhrubhata as being capable of becoming Rases. In the Vyasaśāstra-stage, Bhoga held all the forty-seven Dhrubhata as Rases.

एतेन सारसालस्य एतेन पूर्वं कीर्तिः । सारसालस्येवमेतस्य-  
सालस्ये विनासमुत्पन्नमिवर्तिमिवेतत् सारसालस्ये एतेनकेवलमिदं  
सालस्य सारसालस्य । *Sp. Pra. Vol. II, p. 101.*

एतेनैव विदुः सारसालस्ये

सर्वमिदं विनासमुत्पन्नमिव



Harṣa and the rest? If it is said that Rati etc. also become Rasas by virtue of their being Sthāyina, why are not Harṣa and others Sthāyina? It cannot be said that all these eight and these eight only are 'permanent' and Harṣa etc. are 'floating'. Among these eight also, there are Bhava, Hras, Soka, Krodha etc. which are not 'permanent'. Permanence or Eternity is not inherent in any *Itihāsa* necessarily but is born as a result of character and circumstances. Universality and the quality of being a major mood do not pertain to these eight only. Even as so much a major mood, as a character and as a set of conditions, as Raga. Therefore, even as Rati, Gīṭā (Delight), or Harṣa (Disgust), have their own Vyākṛti-rūpa, Anubhūti and Vibhīti.<sup>1</sup> Provided the poet develops these Harṣa etc. also with their attendant emotional conditions, they also attain to Sthāyina and Rasatva. That, in a later section devoted to illustration, Bhaga speaks of *Rasadeśa* Ras with Harṣa as its Sthāyina.<sup>2</sup> (S. K. Ā., p. 636 and *Śrīgītā Prakāśa*, Vol. II, p. 384.) On pp. 384-5 of his *Śrīgītā Prakāśa* (Vol. II) and p. 427 of his S. K. Ā., he speaks, along with the Vra and Uddhata Rasas, of the new Rasas Sthāyina, *Rasadeśa*, *Purāṇa*, and *Pīṭhāyā*. On p. 389 of the *Śrīgītā Prakāśa* (Vol. II) and 429 of his S. K. Ā., he speaks of Sādhana, Vīra, Anurāga and Sādhana Rasas. This means Rādhaka who mentioned Mādhava only, is all the Citarepita and generally the Vyākṛti-rūpa, as Rasas. But Bhaga extends Rasatva to Sthāyina also, which

<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, in Cāṇ. XIII-XIV, (Vol. III, Man. 358), Bhaga gives the Vibhīti, Anubhūti and Vyākṛti-rūpa of all the four main *Itihāsa*. According to Abhinava, only the eight or nine Sthāyina are true Vyākṛti-rūpa. Vibhīti and Anubhūti are granted to all.

<sup>2</sup> The Vīra (heroic), as pointed out above, grows out of Sādhana as a Ras, with Sādhana as its Sthāyina. Consequently, Sādhana, as *Rasadeśa*'s Vyākṛti-rūpa and the N. D.'s Sādhana is really Sthāyina Ras.

are physical manifestations. And to that respect, he agrees with Nāradaśāstrī who says while commenting on the *Śi' in Rādhā*—‘इति सर्वस्य सारसर्वं’—

इतिराजः सर्वकारः । एवमसौ सर्वसर्वं सत्यं सर्वविधि-  
सम्पन्नं सर्वसिद्धं सा रोदसा ।

Though called *Śhīrasa*, the *Śhīrasas* are physical manifestations. इतिराजः सर्वकारः, says *Śhīrasāstra* in his *Rādhāśāstrī*. But even these are *Rasa*, as much as any *Cetāvatī*, to *Śhīpa*. Fortunately the immature *Uddipana* *Vāśhīrasa* like the *Mahārasāstra* and *Mānāgīta* and the *Rādhāsa*, *Vāśhīrasa* which are characters themselves are not made *Rasa*. To these *Śhīpa* would be content to give the name ‘*Rādhāsvayābhāsa*’. But these seem to have been persons, before *Śhīpa* also, who would take, as the *Darsanīka* points out, such subjects as *Nṛpaṇī* and *Alīsa* as *Rasa*.

From a passage in the *Locana* of *Abhinava*, we understand that a period of chaos prevailed in the world of *Rasa*. *Abhinava* says that some held the pure *Vāśhīrasa* only as *Rasa*; some *Śhīrasa* only; some the *Vyābhāsa* only; some the interplay of all these; some the story enacted itself and some all this put together.

सर्वे तु पुनं विद्वान्, सर्वे पुनपुनसर्वं, केचित् सारविज्ञानम्,  
इति सारविज्ञानम्, सर्वे सारविज्ञानम्, सर्वे सारविज्ञानम्, सर्वे सारविज्ञानम्,  
सर्वसर्वं सारविज्ञानम् सर्वम् ।<sup>1</sup> *Locana*, p. 68.

It is perhaps on the authority of this passage in the *Locana* that Jagannātha Paṇḍita says in his *Śi' G.*, p. 28.

“विद्वत्तारः यत्, सारविज्ञानं सारम्” इति वदन्ति । “यत् स  
एव सारविज्ञानं स एव सारविज्ञानं तु सर्वसर्वं यत्” इति वदन्ति ।



‘सामान्यो विना नृप रसः’ इति जने । ‘समुपलब्धता तया’  
इति । ‘सामान्येन नृप तया यद्विपरीति’ इति वैजय । ”

Such a view of the concept of Rasa has been criticised by Abhinavagupta. Surely the very nature of the Bhava, namely the character, the *Rasabhinaya*, cannot be called Rasa. Things like Musement and Southern Beauty, which are Jada and are conditions of Rases leading the emotions, *Vidiprasa*, cannot possibly be mental states, *Catavaya*, and are thus not to be called Rasa. Similarly the *Shirya*. What *Bhava* is that which is a drop of water and *Rasabhinaya* which is hair standing on end? While defining, explaining and illustrating the eight *Shirya* which are also Rases to him, Bhaja says in his S. R. J. (pp. 498-500) that though clay becomes Rases, clay, being *Shirya*, are not attended by secondary feelings.

“यत्र न स्यात् पुनरपि सामान्यत्वं तत्र नानुपपत्तिरिति  
साधुप्रासादिकपुनरपि । ”

“सामान्य (S. R. J.) सामान्यत्वं नानुपपत्तिरिति न  
साधु । ” S. R. J., p. 498.

What does Bhaja mean by such qualified Rases? How can an unattended thing be-motivated Pasa or developed? If it is still looking up to something to render itself understood (*anupapatti*), how is it feeling? A mere description of *Shirya* cannot make an instance of *Rasabhinaya*. The concept of Rasa means (I) an emotional state and (II) an emotional state which is “*Prakrit*”. That “*Prakrit*” is not a mere position of a poet containing a *Bhava*. It means that the *Bhava* is, by nature, a major mood, within which occur a number of secondary emotional states. Only such a

major state of mind can be reinforced by attendant conditions. Bhoga says *Ghata* can be reinforced by *Druma* etc. This is not possible. When it is said that one is *Ghata*, fatigued, the question is at once asked, and the mind does not rest without asking this question, why is he fatigued? That is, there cannot be 'fatigued' as a colour or feeling looking; such a minor mood is common to more than one state of mind. One may be fatigued because of *Vigrahasthita*, because of light in *Vra*, because of yoga practice in *Prata*. But when it is said that *Rasna* loves *Sita*, there is no more question. A *Siddhanta* explains a world of feelings; it is like a master with many servants; it is independent, *Bravanta* and *Ananyavakhan*-*prahat*, *Ananyavakhyat* and *Bravanta*. This is the significance of the simple but effective words of King and the followers. Abhinava clearly explains the position thus:

“अवस्थे न कदापि वाच्यं तद्विद् विभावयति, तस्मै कलकल  
प्रवाहनात् कन्दुप्राप्तः, लाजनि भविष्यत्यन्तात् । यतो वाच्यत्वात्  
ततो विभावकतुनासात्, तद्विभावयितुमेव न तद्विभावयतेऽपि विभवेन  
कन्दुप्राप्तोक्तिरिति हेतवतोऽपि तद्विदित्वा तदाशेन चर्तयताम् ।”

Abh. Dh. I, p. 183.

“हे तेने कन्दुप्राप्तत्वात्ते विभावः वताम् वाच्यभूतौ कन्दु-  
प्राप्ताः ते न वाच्यत्वेन अवर्तयन् ।”

“वाच्यत्वेन वाच्यं विभावयितुमेव न विवक्षितम् ।”

ibid., Ch VII, p. 343

As regards the criticism that some among the accepted *Siddhanta* of old are less permanent, Abhinava accepts that there does exist a graded *Prabhāṅga* among them. He accepts also that sometimes, the *Siddhanta* become *Vyākhyāna* but *Vyākhyāna* do not become *Rasa*. *Prabhāṅga*

are always *Faustian*.<sup>1</sup> It cannot be contended that all *Edras* are equally relevant to the *Purushitaru*. The point in the argument of *Caturvargapada* is this: There are any number of things that man aspires for and works to get; but all these fall under the four heads of *Dharma*, *Artha*, *Kama* and *Moksa*. Similarly, though any feeling of man, as such, cannot but be related to his activity towards *Caturvargapada*, there is a classification and grouping possible among them, according to which we arrive at a few dominant heads, under which the rest can be brought. The argument of '*Ratna-siddhanta*,' means this: Though there is *Ānandasya* in everything in poetry and drama, it is only some mental conditions that can be handled as leading themes; how can *Gita* be worked at as the *Rasa* of a drama and who will relish it?

Jagadisa purusha adopts a peculiar attitude towards this question. He raises the problem by pointing out *Black's* as an additional *Rasa*. As love for God, an *Anurāga*, it cannot be brought under *Viśāda*, since *Viśāda* implies absence of any *Raga*. He explains that all *Ras* except the *Ras* between man and woman is only a *Edras* and can never become a *Rasa*. If it is argued that *Elaborated Ras* can be taken as the

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Abhinava, the *Vyākhyāṭaka* are always *Faustian* in *Viśāda*, they are *Śaśvata* and *Purushitaru* together as they are *Ras* or *Edras*. There is a writer, later than *Vyākhyāṭaka*, named *Viśvavāṇīśvara* *Śiṣya*, of the *Āṇḍarāṭra*, who seems to follow the view of writer like *Viśāda*. For he says that *Vyākhyāṭaka* are of two kinds, *Śaśvata* and *Purushitaru*; when they go to higher studies, they are the latter; they are the former when they do not have to beguile a sister.

सर्वः सर्वस्य रसो रसोऽस्ति ।

विश्ववर्णेश्वरः सर्वस्य रसोऽस्ति ।

अथ सर्वस्य रसो रसोऽस्ति न हि रसो न मातः ॥३॥, pp. 112-3

He however does not explain his position further.

Śhīṭya-Rasa and the Śarīra-Rasa be relegated to the list of emotions, another will propose Rasa for children as a Śhīṭya and a third will ask why Jaṭupā and Voka cannot be put down as Vyākṛāntas instead of being called Śhīṭyana. The whole system of Bhārata will thus have to be overhauled and this is far from desirable. Bhārata alone is the guide and authority in deciding which Bhāva is Śhīṭya and which Vyākṛānta.

“ न वाली शालाश्लेष्मदीभक्तिः । अनुमत्त वैराग्यविमलभाद् ।  
 वल्लभे—वलिः देवमिलितमिलितं वल्लभदीप्ततां वल्लभदीप्तताः ।  
 . . . . . अनादिदुःखिभवाभावेन वल्लभतादिभक्त्याभावेन,  
 वल्लभभावेनात् । अथवा दुःखमिलिततां वलि रीः स्वमिलितं वल्लभे  
 न वल्लभः । न वल्लभः वल्लभः वल्लभभावेन वल्लभभावेनात् । अथवा  
 वल्लभभावेनात् । वल्लभः वल्लभभावेन वल्लभभावेनात् । वल्लभः  
 वल्लभभावेनात् । वल्लभः वल्लभभावेन वल्लभभावेनात् । ” B. C. 30, 45-6

### BLISS AND MADNESS RASA

It was pointed out previously how Daṇḍa illustrated *Pragya* by two instances of devotion to God, *Śhānti*. It is natural that, in this land, the sentiment of devotion should have been soon accepted as a *Rasa*. But Abhinava and others proposed to bring it under *Śhānti*. *Śhānti* is the *Rasa* relating to the final *Paropārka*, *Śhānta*; and many are the paths leading to *Śhānta*. The three paths of *Dāna*, *Karma* and *Jñāna* are well-known. It may be that *Śhānti* is in some cases an *Adya* of the *Śhānta* developed on lines of *Jñāna* but the advocates of *Śhānti* held it to be expressed by itself. They made *Jñāna* and *Karma* its aids, the release, *Śhānta*, from everything which the *Jñāni* wanted, the *Śhānta* did not know. He wanted that he should permanently be loving God.

Just as Vira Raga has the four variations, *Shiva* etc., the *Shakti* also has the variations of *Madhura* or *Shyanta* or *Tijada*, etc., just as in the case of the Ganga towards *Rajya*, *Sakhya* as in the case of *Ajaya*, *Vishaya* as in the case of *Bavali*, *Yasali*, *Varasava* and *Sanda*, *Ilaya* or *servitude* as in the case of other devatas. The elaboration of *Shakti Raga* on these lines is the special contribution of the rhetoricians of Bengal who followed the school of *Cantasya*. *Raja* Govindan's two works, the *Shakti-rasamuktavali* and the *Ugandharanana* deal with the *Shakti Raga* at very great length. Dr. Abanipriyadar Gaha has dealt with this subject in an article on the *Raga Cult* in the *Cantasaparatishrupsa* in the *Samachar Bhaskara* (New Jubilee Volume (III) and Dr. S. K. Deb's complete account of 'the *Shakti-Raga* System of Bengal Vaisnavism' in the *IBQ* (Vol. VIII) for 1932, removes the need for any further contribution on this subject.

These *Vallabhava Bhakti-bhaktas* accept the eight *Ragas* of *Ekanta*; accept the *Shakti*; accept the *Vishadya*; accept the '*Sacha-padipitha Prapita*' as the '*Kandam-satyapitha* *Sachya*' or *Sachya* and add only one absolutely new *Raga*-concept, namely *Ilaya*. Thus they speak of twelve *Ragas* but they give a new orientation to the whole scheme, whereas has the speciality of their school. The old *Shyanta* becomes the chief *Raga*, it is *Rat* for their God; it is also called *Madhura* and *Tijada*. Along with the *Madhura*, there are four others which are primary; they are *Shiva*, *Ilaya*, *Sakhya* and *Vishadya*. These five are called the five *Shaktiya Shakti Raga*. The rest, the seven (*Shiva*, *Adhira*, *Vira*, *Karuna*, *Shikha*, *Shyanta* and *Kandira*), are secondary, the *Ganga Shakti Raga*. The primary *Shakti Raga* numbering five are the five forms of *Shakti*; the seven secondary *Raga* are

names as two Vyākṛtāntas for the two primary Rāhas, for they are Rāhas only when they involve Rāga and—

बाल बाल (कलम) बलु छ बाल

हुल बलि छ बली ए कल बलम ।

हामबहुलीबलबलीबलबली

कल विम बले बील बल छ हुल ।

कल लालापी बली छे बलबली

कल बील बालबलु बल छे बलबली ॥

(Quoted by Dr. A. K. Gaha in the article all. to above.)

According to the table given by Dr. De in his article (p. 66), Dīya is called Pīta (rendered as Pāṭhāṇa) and Bāhya is called Pīya (rendered as Pāṇāṇa).

Kavharapūra's *Alakṣita Kāśikā* is a regular *Alakṣita* treatise but it introduces some ideas of these Vajrayana *Alakṣitās* also. Kavharapūra does not give a full classification into Mūhya and Gupta Rāsa, and we miss also Dīya in his work. He accepts the right Rāsa of Bharata, the Śrīra and the Vīraśyā. To these two he adds two more, Preman and Bhakti. Preman is the name he gives to the Madhura Rāsa, the direct Śyāgita between Rāga and the Gupta. He considers Citāśrāva as the Śhīśyā. According to him, this love is not Śyāgita. He also records the view of some who hold Śyāgita as the Rāsa between Rīkṣi and Rāga and says that, in that case, Preman will be the Aṅga of that Śyāgita. But, according to himself, Preman is the Aṅga; Śyāgita the Aṅga. This Preman, Kavharapūra considers as Love Superior within which every other Rāsa comes.

“अथ देवरा . . . अथ विराज बली । केरले छे  
कल बलबलीबली बलीबली बल । बलीबलीबलीबलीबलीबली ।

केसकिन्त्यो कीराचकुन्त्यो वृद्धश्च एव यत् । कन्दोऽम्बेऽनुप्राप्तम्  
 यद्वचनम् । सुखोऽहो देव यद्वत्, यद्वचनं यन्निवृत्तिवत् । यत् तु  
 वेदज्ञो, सुखोऽवशिष्टं विदोः । अतः य—

कण्ठमग्निं विमग्निं देवपुत्रमनुजम् ।

कौं लब्धम् यद्वचनं यद्वत् इव यन्निवृत्तिः ॥ A. Kan., p. 146.

This view of Prama will make it the basic Love, which Bhaga also says, lies at the root, as *Atishayika*, of *Man* and *Pita*.

The Vijnana King Varasiddhanta, a great devotee of Kṛṣṇa and the author of a number of works on Kṛṣṇa, (A. D. 1815-6) treats of Bhagavad Bhakti as a Kama at the end of his treatise *Sarvasiddhanta*. This *Esopodical Kṛṣṇa*, *Notion of Māhā*, Vol VII, p. 708. No. 1827. It would be interesting to compare his elaboration of the subject with that of the Bengali Vijnana Bhaktiśāstra.

#### MADHUSIDDHANTA SARASVATĪ ON BHAKTI KAMA

It is a well-known fact that Madhusiddhanta-sarasvatī, the great Advaitic writer, was a great devotee of the personal God in the form of Kṛṣṇa. In this role, he has left to us a *Itihas*, and a treatise on devotion called *Bhagavadbhaktirasamaya*,<sup>2</sup> a work, in which the subject is approached from the point of view of the *Bhaktiśāstra*. It reproduces the Bhakti Kama. Though this Kama is old and has been dealt with by others, as can be seen from the foregoing survey, the treatment by Madhusiddhanta-sarasvatī has its own peculiarities.

Generally, the *Parasūthas* are said to be four, *Dharma*, *Artha*, *Kāma* and *Mokṣa*. M. S. says that *Parasūthas* is

<sup>2</sup> *Samana Iti*, 1827.

really one which is thus sustained by misery, दुःखानिबद्धम्, and that, if one speaks of four Paroplerthas, one calls the means the end, adopting the common Upadesa (p. 2). Since devotion to God, Bhagavad-Bhakti, is one of the ways of attaining such sustained bliss, Bhakti also is a Paroplertha.

अथे वयमप्यभिप्रेतवान्मे ह्युत्तरं निबद्धमनेनैव वारमुत्तरमभि-  
प्रेतम्—' निबद्धमनेनैव निबद्धमप्युत्तरम् ' इति । p. 2.

Mr. S. separates Jñāna and Bhakti and consequently does not include Bhakti in the fourth Paroplertha, Mokṣa. He bases himself on the difference in character as aspirants to spiritual salvation, which explains why some take to the path of knowledge, Jñāna, and some to the path of devotion, Bhakti. Firm minds seek the former through cultivated Śraddhā, while softer minds tending to be emotional seek the latter.

एवम् अनुचितान्म निबद्धमं वारुहान् । अनुचितान् ह्यु-  
त्तरमप्यभिप्रेतवान्मेवमप्युत्तरमप्युत्तरमप्युत्तरमप्युत्तर-  
मप्युत्तरम् । p. 2.

On the basis of various texts in the Bhāgavata, he even says that Jñāna also becomes a means and not an end, a means to the attainment of Citragovinda, which is necessary for Bhakti. This makes Jñāna a reduction of Bhakti.

"अथ 'अथे वयम् अभिप्रेतम्' (म. 3.3. 29.) इति वचनेन  
एव वारुहान्मप्युत्तरम् उच्यते ।" p. 2.

<sup>1</sup> On p. 12 Mr. S. points out the difference between Bhakti and Bhaktamardha or Jñāna. The two are thus for two different kinds of aspirants. The common aim or objective as such is a condition for Bhakti, whereas, only he who has acquired the four







इत्येव इवास्मादपराभूतत्वेऽपिहोक्तमेति वदन्तीति । १७

According to M. S., the Bhaktas of Bhakti is God, the Karm evolved, Parasaktas, is God; and the Sahitya, the mood which has taken God's form, is also God. How is this explained? M. S. says that God the Bhaktas is independent and is the Basis of which the Sahitya as well as the Parasaktas. The form of God is ineffable Brahman.

अस्मात् परात्मन्यस्तस्यः सत्यमेव हि ।

सर्वोत्तमस्तुत्यास्तुत्यामेति सुप्रसन्नम् । १८, १९, p. 18.

निम्नोक्तं सुप्रसिद्धमेव सर्वोत्तमं सर्वोत्तममिदमुच्यते । परात्मन्यस्य अस्मात् सत्यमेव हि सर्वोत्तमम् । सर्वोत्तमस्तुत्यामेति सुप्रसन्नम् । परात्मन्यस्यस्तुत्यामेति सुप्रसन्नम् । परात्मन्यस्यस्तुत्यामेति सुप्रसन्नम् । परात्मन्यस्यस्तुत्यामेति सुप्रसन्नम् । १८, १९, p. 18.

M. S. then recognizes that the following Bhaktas can become Sahityas and Karmas. 1. Karm becoming Sahityas and Parasaktas, 2. Karm becoming Dvaya as in Bhakti and Karmas, 3. Bhakti, 4. Bhakti (Dvaya, Sahitya, Parasaktas, and Parasaktas), 5. Karm becoming form for Karmas; 6. Bhakti, 7. Parasaktas, 8. Dvaya (Dvaya, Dvaya and Dvaya), 9. Bhakti, 10. Bhakti, and 11. Karmas (II, 21-22). Of these, Dvaya, Bhakti, Parasaktas, and Karmas are not part of Bhakti Karmas (II, 27-28). Similarly Dvaya, form of Bhakti and Bhakti are not part of Bhakti (II, 28). So also Bhakti and Bhakti are not part of Bhakti (II, 28). The rest form part of Bhakti (II, 21-22). As pointed out already, M. S. is of opinion that Bhakti Karmas and Bhakti Parasaktas are for "Advaitas" and that both differ from Bhakti which is a

separate Panchaksha. Hence, it excludes Shakti from Bhakti. But as can be seen in the earlier section, the Bhakti Kasa scheme of Kāpa and where about Shakti in Bhakti. This, the author of the gloss on M.S. also points out. M.S. rules out of the range of Bhakti, Bhava-Vin and Dhyā-Vin because their Kambhata differs; Kambha and Bhava are against love and Dhyā cannot produce any Deva.

Those who did not accept Bhakti as a separate Kasa considered it as a Bhava, a variety of Kati, the object of which was God. इवमिति कति । To these writers, M.S. replies that the Bhava-Kasa described as 'Devadhyāyati' refers to Kati for the gods like Indra and others. Kati for the one supreme God is a Kasa.

इतिवदिति कति । इतिवदति । इतिवदति ।

कति । इतिवदति । इतिवदति । इतिवदति ।

इतिवदति । इतिवदति । इतिवदति । इतिवदति ।

इतिवदति । इतिवदति । इतिवदति । इतिवदति ।

Bhakti Kasa is the real Kasa, since here it is that one has the ineffable bliss that is not tasted by even a grain of saava. Dhyāna and other Kasa cannot reach this bliss and are inferior; they are like glow-worms. Bhakti is the very Deva.

इतिवदिति कति । इतिवदति । इतिवदति ।

इतिवदति । इतिवदति । इतिवदति ।

इतिवदति । इतिवदति । इतिवदति ।

इतिवदति । इतिवदति । इतिवदति ।

## THE NINE RASAS

The advent of Śhānta lately gave rise to another controversial Rasa called Māyā. Just as there is the possibility of departing the Śhānta Rasa with the psychological, religious and metaphysical concepts like Jñāna, Bhakti, Dharma, Dharma, Saṁskṛti etc., there is also the possibility of departing the Māyā Rasa by showing the justness ruling as Śhānta as a result of Mithyājñāna or Avēdya, with characters Kṛpā, Krodha, Lobha and the like. Even as Śhānta is the Rasa of the state called Māyā, Māyā is the Rasa of the state called Pūrvā. In a philosophical drama, the Rasa from which the hero escapes into the Śhānta, will be Māyā. The Sanskritologist of Bikanāgar puts it forward thus:

विप्लवो हि—सुखविप्लवः । विप्लो मया प्रकृतः,  
मया सुखी भवत्यस्य हृदि परिवर्ति । दृ. १५८.

He points out that how the Māyā cannot be identified with as included in Śhānta etc., all of which come within its fold. Śhānta and the seven other Śhāntas become the Vyākṛti-śāntas of this Rasa.

विप्लु विप्लु एव पृथिव्योपमोपेयान्मनुष्यपुत्रनिष्कलान्  
कलानी विवेकी न । देव एव जनिवर्जिता इति ।

The Śhānta of this Rasa is Mithyājñāna.

अर्धं न सुखविप्लवकालाया राजा एव । विप्लवकाला  
व्यभिक्तः । विप्लवः साक्षात्प्रेमोपासकवर्गवर्गः । अमुखाः दुःख-  
कालविप्लवकालाः ।

The Madhukarmasādhya-campā follows the Rasadarśanī and describes the Mīṭh-Rasa of Pratyak as well as the Śānta-Rasa of Nirvṛti (K. vol. 15, p. 106).

Caṇakyaśāstrīślokaśloka cites the Rasadarśanī on Mīṭh-Rasa and criticises it:

यतोऽपि किल—यथावा यदादिभिर्न यदावयवाद् यदावयवम् ।  
 तदाह तर्हि यथा एव । यदा वा यतोऽपि विमलान्वयिः यथावाः  
 कालमिति, यथाविमलान्वद् । यदुक्तम् यथावयविकत्वात् यो एवो विम-  
 लायकः । यतोऽयम् यदावयवयोगेन यथावा एवमवयवम् । यथा  
 हि तु यथा विमलान्वयिर्न यदावयवेति विद् । यदा एव यदावयव-  
 यदावयवयोः योऽयम् । यथावाः ।<sup>11</sup>

Rāyachārṇava, *Samaratī Dharma Śāstra*, XVI, p. 18.

This scholastic criticism, going into some of the features of the concept of Mīṭh as adopted in *ślokaśloka*, does not meet the question properly. If it is argued that Rasa is 'Napa', 'Āśandartpa' and hence of the form of the Brahman, and consequently Mīṭh which is different from Brahman cannot be a Rasa, how does the author propose to explain Śṛṅgāra etc. as Rasa? They all come under Mīṭh. If a portrait of Eklakṣa, Śrīyāśoka and Kṛṣṇa can be Rasa, why not Mīṭh? One objection that can be considered is however not maintained by the critic of the Mīṭh-Rasa and it is this: As an opposite of the Śānta-Rasa, a Mīṭh-Rasa is no doubt present; but it is not a unitary Rasa. It is made up of Śṛṅgāra and the seven other Rasas. Any given specimen possessing a mundane activity can be called by one of the eight names, Śṛṅgāra etc. It is not necessary to have a separate Rasa as Mīṭh which is only the common name of all the eight mundane Rasas of Pratyak. Suppose, in a



The commentary of Maheśvara Hemacandra<sup>1</sup> explains that *Vijñāna* is the Rasa of Rashlessness, then come give in its place *Shyāma* as a Rasa and that the *Shyāma* is included in *Rasā* and hence not mentioned separately.

“वीर्यवति रसस्तुल्यवती राजनीलस्तुल्यवतिरसो यदे-  
ष्यतेरसविशेषो वीर्यरसः । तस्य कथं न कथयन्मन्मथविष्णु-  
वर्णविभवः स्वामीति ततः परतोऽन्यथ । न चेद् वीर्यरसोऽसौ-  
विशेषाद् इहम् वीर्यः ।”

In defining, however, the text gives a name in which we see *Shyāma* instead of *Rasā*, to explain which the commentator says that the text describes not *Rasā* as such, but describes it through its effect, *Shyā*. The *Lakṣya-śloka* is—

कथमेवमस्मत्पञ्चमध्यामिन्मन्मथविष्णुः ।

लमेदंरसविशेषमस्मिन्नेति ततः । (अथा)

The discussion is however for *Rasā* proper:

स्तुल्यवतिरिहस्तुल्य कथ्यतेह ततः परतोऽन्यथ ।

इति तस्य तस्यविशेषोऽस्मिन्नेति ततोऽन्यथ ।

The commentator explains that though the *Lakṣyaśloka* means only the *Shyāma* or *Rasā*, it has to be taken as referring to the cause of *Shyāma*, *Rasā* also.

<sup>1</sup> The commentator's date is the end of the 12th cent. and early part of the 13th. He wrote his *Prasanga* in 1187 A.D. and *Haradibhāṣā* in 1193 A.D. (*Winternitz, History of Ind. Lit. Sag. Trans. II, p. 589*). He is different from the author of the *Shyāmaśloka*.



“यत् कलात्मककलादिभ्यः सङ्गुतम् अभिव्यक्तिरिहम् अत्रापि  
एव कर्तुं, कलायां तैदृशम्, निष्ठु निष्ठान्वितैरनस्तुम्भो वाक्यात्  
तैदृशत्वं निश्चितमित्यनेन । . . . तैदी एव, कौस्तुभकलात्मके  
इत्यम्, कलायां न निष्ठम् एव स्यात् । नत एव तैदृशित्व-  
सुखमेवास्तिपदमेव सङ्गुतम् इतिनिरूपेति । अत्रैवावहित्यायं तु  
स्य स्या एव सङ्गुतमित्यनें वक्ष्येन ।”

If the number of Rasas is to be reduced by omitting the Rases which are produced by other Rasas or the Rasas which are the causes of other Rasas, we shall arrive at four Rasas, proceeding on the basis of Bharata's indication of the Kiraup-kiraup-khiva arising among the eight Rasas, सङ्गुतम् अभिव्यक्तः etc. Such a process of reducing the number is illogical. There is no reason why the causal Rases should be retained and the affected Rases dismissed and why it should not be vice versa.

Coming to the Vidyakula Rases, the definition and illustration are as follows :

विश्वमेवार्जुनार्जुनस्यार्जुनविश्वमेवतः ।

वीरवशो नम एते कलात्मककलादिभ्यः ।

अथ—

हि वीरकलात्मिकात् कलात्मककलादिभ्यः कलादिभिः ।

विश्वे कलात्मके वीरवशो सङ्गुतमित्यम्, ॥

(अथ)

According to the gloss, this is a verse addressed by a would-be bride to her friend. The reference is to a proverbial marriage custom according to which, elderly women and

men, including the father-in-law and the mother-in-law, pay their respects to the bride and the groom of the bride after the nuptial night. The bride is taken round and elders reward her for her chastity. The thought of the elders rewarding her produces shame in the bride's heart.

This however is a mere *Vyākhyāna* and hardly a *Rasa*. *Vijñā* of the same description is given by Bhāsa as one of the thirty-three *Vyākhyānas*.

## THE VARIETIES OF THE SAME RASA.

THE LAST RASA *Sringara* has two phases, *Samhanga* and *Vipralambha*, the two *Adhishthana*, as Bharata says, of *Sringara*. There is a peculiar note in this connection provided by King Rupaśāstra, whom I have already mentioned in the section on the *Vikata Rasa*, as holding two Rasas called the *Vikata* and the *Bhittanta*. Haripilla accepts *śānta Rasa*, the eight of *Bharata*, *Vikata* and *Vipralpa* and then new Rasas, *Samhanga*, *Vipralambha* and *Bhittanta*. The peculiarity of the *Bhittanta-Rasa* and its difference from the *Vikata* have already been explained.

सुखी दुःखदायक च बीजतः कल्पयति ।

वीर्यं कल्पयत्युन्नेति तैदम्भोऽनुसंधानम् ॥

सुखी दुःखान्निदः कदाचिद् दृष्टव्यमस्मदात्तम् ॥

सुन्दरी विराज्यते कदाचिद् दृष्टव्यम् ॥ p. 16.

Haripilla has three different Rasas, *Sringara*, *Samhanga* and *Vipralambha*. He considers them separate, when, according to him, their characters differ essentially. He thus upsets his case against the ancients.

सुन्दरी विराज्यते कदाचिद् दृष्टव्यम् ॥

कदाचिद् दृष्टव्यम् सुन्दरी विराज्यते ॥

लोके रासम् (१) पूर्वे संदेहो विराज्यते ।  
 गुह्यतमं मेरी द्वे कथितौ—उदात्तपदम् ।  
 यद्विराज्य गुह्यम् कञ्च/भित्तो दशमे पदे ।  
 उदात्तपदमेतु रास्य न विरोधते ।  
 सर्वजगुः रासम्वात् सर्वोत्पत्तिरिति विवक्षा ।  
 यद्विराज्यमपि संदेहो यः गुह्यतमः (३) दृग् ॥  
 उदात्तः सुविशिष्टः गुह्यतो दुर्निर्दिष्टः ।  
 यद्विद्वो दुःकषायी न विराज्योऽभिवाद्यः ॥  
 यः गुह्यतो भित्तो विराज्य उदात्तः ।  
 यदायस्य वीर्यं यदाय यदाय न ।  
 यो मेरी विराज्यता संदेहान् न न सतः ॥ p. 4.

*Śṛṅgāra* has always been considered as *Ujyāla* and *Prāsa*, a Rasa of love of cultivated taste and of sophisticated persons, the *Uttamapadyatā*. Therefore, at course of time, *Prāsa* and *Ujyāla* became synonyms of *Śṛṅgāra*. In an unsophisticated taste, there is *Śṛṅgāra* but only in a way. The account also explains that love in birds and beasts is not *Rasa*, but only its semblance, *Rasābhāsa*. Therefore, love as understood by the word *Śṛṅgāra* is *Arūpa* and *Kāraṇīya*, being present only in high class individuals. But love of a kind which is the joy a pair derives mutually is present in all living beings, man, birds and beasts. This love need not be called *Śṛṅgāra*. When it may be separated into a distinct *Rasa* and called *Sambhoga*.

Now coming to Rāmapān's view regarding *Vipralambha*. Since both *Śṛṅgāra* and *Sambhoga* are of a pleasurable nature, and *Vipralambha* is essentially of a painful nature, the latter is a separate *Rasa*. If *Śṛṅgāra* be *Prāsa* and *Ujyāla*,

Viprasakṣha, is 'Māhina'. Viprasakṣha may be due to *Śṛṅga* or *Sandhoga*. This near effect relationship between *Śṛṅga* and *Viprasakṣha* is not proof of their essential identity. The two differ as much as *Vra* and *Śāṅkha*, of which the former produces the latter.

If love among higher classes is different from rustic love and love among birds and animals, equally do the separations, *Viprasakṣha*, in the two cases differ. Strictly speaking, *Harṣa* should have two Rasas for Love in separation.

*Harṣa* gives *Ālambita* as the *Śāṅga* of *Śṛṅga*, *Rati* of *Sandhoga* and *Ānand* of *Viprasakṣha*.

अपराधः कर्म . . . . .

“ “ “ “ “

“ “ “ “ “ वीरपात्री तथा ।

कर्मिणे स्वर्गिणे तथाः कर्मण् कर्मिण्यपि ॥ p. 17.

The *śāṅga* were not masters of the psychology of *Viprasakṣha*, but they did not consider it, on the score, as a separate Rasa. *Ānandya* as long as is at the root of *Viprasakṣha*. This longing is only a kind of *Rati*. *Ānand* can only be an intermediate state in the ten *Avasthā* of love and it is not the basic state of mind that permeates throughout *Viprasakṣha*. The slender line of *Rati* runs through the state of *Viprasakṣha*, and if this *Rati* is not accepted in *Viprasakṣha*, as its *Śāṅga*, there can be no difference between *Viprasakṣha* and *Karṇa*. The *Rasakāśikā* of *Rasachūṣa* also agrees that *Rati* is not at the base of happiness, since *Viprasakṣha* is far from being pleasurable.

आनन्दप्रसन्नार्थं सौ. वैशिष्ट्यम्, सविभक्तम् । निवेद्येयम्:

आनन्दप्रसन्नार्थं सौदीपम् । Ras. MS., p. 2.

The Rasakāñḍī, however, does not separate Viprakāśha as a distinct Ras, but takes it, as all do, as a phase of Śṛṅgita only. It agrees with Haripada in taking Viprakāśha as standing in the way of accepting Ras to be of the nature of pleasure. Ras will then be, according to the Rasakāñḍī, a state of pleasure as well as pain. Vīra-yoga, though apparently and immediately painful, is ultimately a state of pleasure. The very life of Ras is a certain longing; and this exists in Sambhoga as well as in Viprakāśha. That it contradicts the life of Ras is seen from what Kālidāsa and Māyavijaya say: *śṛṅgāra-śāntiḥ guṇī* (Śṛṅgarika) and *śṛṅgāra-śāntiḥ* (Śṛṅgāra-śānti). Therefore, Viprakāśha is an aspect of Śṛṅgita only, and of Viprakāśha also, Ras is the Śānti.

"*शृंगारे शान्तिं कथं . . . शान्तिश्चैव रास-  
संगमः ।*"

A. K. S. Kālidāsa-śānti.

To match its opinion that Ras is not combined pleasure, the Rasakāñḍī says that Ras itself is of the nature of both pleasure and pain, but of this more in a further section.

To return to Haripada's Sambhoga Ras, he postulated this for the love of those who are not Utkarṣapātrika. The love of birds and beasts described as largely in the *Śṛṅga* which was being known by the name *Rasa-śāntiḥ*, comes under Haripada's Sambhoga Ras. Vidyādhara, the author of the *Ekavali*, refuses to recognize that the love of birds and beasts is *Rasa-śāntiḥ*. He says that their love also is Ras. If it is said that the birds and beasts do not consciously enjoy or enjoy in such a manner as cultivated men and women do, such knowledge and cultivated taste, Vidyādhara says, is irrelevant. Why should the subject know what it is enjoying

or love is subject, provided it enjoys? Kumbhakarā notes this view of Vidyābhāṣa in his commentary on the *Pratiparicchaya* :

‘एवमिहोक्तं नानुसृत्योऽप्यसौचित्यमन्येन सतीत्यनुसृत्यैव विद्वत्-  
कविपरीतवृत्तिवत् नानुसृत्यैव इत्यमरः । एत एवमसौचित्य इति चेन्नित् ।  
सुखे विद्याभोजन— विद्याविद्वत्समये हि तं कति कतिवचः, न विद्या-  
विद्वत् । एतच्च विद्याभोजनेन साः ।’ p. 11, Bala-munorāṁ Edn.

Earlier than Kumbhakarā, Vidyābhāṣa noticed this view of Vidyābhāṣa, and as a staunch follower of the accepted tradition, criticised it. The discussion on his R. A. S. is too long to be quoted in full. (R. A. S. Edn., pp. 208-82) Vidyābhāṣa's view is then stated:

‘कथं तु सत्त्वमसौचित्यं दम्बकते । इत् न परीक्षावत् ।  
केचन सत्त्वमसौचित्यवत् । विद्याविद्वत्समयवृत्तिसंघः न सत्त्वमसौचित्य-  
वृत्तिसंघः सत्त्वमसौचित्यं चेत् न । सुखेभ्यो चेत्तु सत्त्वमसौचित्यं सत्त्वमसौचित्य-  
वत्त्वमसौचित्यं । एतच्च विद्याविद्वत्समये तं कति कतिवचः । न विद्या-  
विद्वत् । एतच्च विद्याभोजनेन साः ।’<sup>1</sup>

The criticism of Vidyābhāṣa is that Vidyābhāṣa is essentially a lover of subjects, Kumbhakarā, who are Śiva and Viṣṇu, it is not enough if, according to their own conditions, birds and beasts do have a consciousness of their love and its art; it is a question of *Analogy*. How can a human being who alone is *Śāntika* for poetry and drama, have *Cirāntika* in such cases? The same Vidyābhāṣa etc. do not apply to the case of the love among birds and beasts, the

<sup>1</sup> That love among birds and beasts has less of art and is less poetic, may not be accepted at all by theologists.

emotional conditions there are called only *Kāma*, *Kāma* etc. *Sāya Śringādhāpikā* :

“यस्य कृताङ्गिणेनयनीं वदितुं वदितुं यदि विनामय इति  
केच न । तस्यां कथयतां वदितुं वदितुं यदि वाच्यत्वम्, न पुनः  
विनामयम् ।”

सिद्धा वदितुमेवेति, कथयते न विनामयम्, यदि तु वाच्य-  
विशेषाद्वदितुमीति विनिर्दिष्टेति ।

“सिद्धा विनामयानं नाम श्रीविश्वविद्या, तेन कथयताः किमेवेति न  
विनामया वदितु । . . . विनामयविशेषाद्वदितुमीत्यत्रापि वाच्य-  
वाच्यत्वे विनामये ॥” R. A. S., pp. 204-5.

Consistent with this argument, *Śringādhāpikā* says that *Anantya* is the only cause of a *Rasa* becoming an *Ākāśa* ; that this *Anantya* is of two kinds, *Anasyava* and *Apyasyava* ; and that in trees and other aspects of nature which are described as *loka-rasas*, the *Rasa* is *Ākāśa* by reason of “*Anasyava*” and in man, low people, and birds and beasts, the *Rasa* is *Ākāśa* by reason of “*Apyasyava*”.

वाच्यत्वात् कथयतामन्तेति विनामयत्वम् ।

कथयतामन्तेत्यत्रापि वदितुं यदि वाच्यम् ॥

कथयतामन्ते इत्, कथयतामन्तेत्यत्रापि ॥ नम् ।

कथयतामन्तेत्यत्रापि वदितुं वदितुमेवेत्यत्रापि ॥

*Komalavilāsa* does not refer *Vidyādhāra*, and *Rājasekhara* simply agrees with *Vidyādhāra*. After reproducing the *Śloka*, *Rājasekhara* says that if the *Kāyaśloka* is not wrong in illustrating *Rāyashloka* *Rasa* with the same



शिवशङ्खनिपात, etc. describing Fear as a *deha*, it is Fear in birds and animals, and not *Manishita*.

अथ एष ब्रह्मलोकविजया 'वीर्यवत्तमिनाम' सुदुर्लभाति  
 तद्वदेव ब्रह्मविः—' इति वीर्येण ब्रह्मलोकस्य विवेचिनस्तत्त्वज्ञा  
 नमुदाहरेत् ।

Kīrtyanepana, Ch. IV, pp. 211-2, Vajrapāṇi Edn.

Possibly, Śāṅghadeśika would reply to Nāgārjuna that the *Rasa* in question is only *Syngata*, and Anurūpavāda was spoken of only regarding the *Rasa* and its *Ākṣha*. But would he accept that other *Rasa* in birds and beasts are not *Ākṣha* and should a distinction be made among the *Rasa*?

Hieplitz's contribution to this controversy is the creation of a *Samāhāya Rasa* for *rasata*, *śāngata*, birds, beasts etc.

Of *Rasa* *Rasa*, Bhavata has given six varieties, ranging from gentle to rough according to the nature of man who are gentle, contentious and so on. Karikānupāya dismissed this number to three. (A. *Ra*, p. 141) Bhavata himself speaks of a broad three-fold classification of laughter according as men are *Uttama*, *Madhya* or *Adhama*, refined, moderately refined or unrefined. (M. S. Ch., VI, pp. 313-7; Gosh. Sū. 2.) Further, Bhavata has recognized that Laughter has two varieties, Laughter with and Laughter w. *Pragata* and *Pragata* or *Rasavāda* and *Pamāda*. (M. S., Ch. VI, p. 314.) Of these, I have spoken elsewhere.

*Karapa* varies according as its cause is *rasa*, *deha* and so on (pp. 319 and 320). On p. 312, *Karapa* is considered to be of three kinds, *Karapa* born of grief to *Uttama*, *Karapa* due to grief to *Adha* and *Karapa* born of *Stoka* in general, i.e., *Stoka* at the loss of relatives and the like. The *Uttaman*

are chiefly sorry on account of Dharma, the Madhyama, on loss of wealth and other possessions (Artha), and perhaps only Adharma are supposed to sorrow too much over the loss of those whom they love (Kāma). This however does not rule out Rāga on the loss of the beloved as an *Uttama-rasika*. It appears that only the third variety is *Vidya* and Rāga proper, and that the first two varieties of *Vidya* is Dharma and Artha, seem to be only *Vyākṛāntika*. These kinds of *Rasika* are given, *Vyāpāra* (general), *Apārādhita* (as having done a mistake) and *Virtalika*, born of being tired by nature. The varieties of *Bhāva*,—*Āpāhāra* and *Udrāga*, or *Kṛānta*, *Udrāga* and *Prādhā*—have been spoken of while considering the possibility of a kind of *Jagat* being the *Bhāva* of the *Vidya*. (See above.) *Adhāra* is *Draṇa* and *Rāndha*, wooden bowl of heavenly manna and that produced by the joy one has when things are achieved. Such classifications of Rāsa do not have any scientific basis or method in them.

Of the varieties of Rāsa, the varieties of *Vidya* have attracted greatest notice, because an early school of opponents of the *Vidya* explained away *Bhāva* as provided for by one of the varieties of the *Vidya* mentioned by Bharata. Bharata mentions three kinds of *harṣa*—*manoharṣa*, *Dāharṣa*, or *la*—*Karṣa*, sticking to right as all sorts, *Dāharṣa*, as in *Yathāgrāha*; and martial *harṣa*, *Yathāgrāha*.

सुखं च भयं च दुःखं च शोकः ।

तं चैव हि वाऽ वा विनिर्दिष्टं हि ॥ B. S., VI, 89.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Bharata's description of *Uttama*.

सर्व (सर्वत्र) तत्रै वै सर्व विनिर्दिष्टोऽपि सः ।

B. S., VII, p. 104.

Here again, the first two Vira do not seem to be Kama, they can only be Eros. If they are developed as main themes, they will become Asura of Eros; or, they will form the Ganes of the Shyama, as Ardha and Uchirakata.

A Deyatra was then proposed and this Deyatra sought to show out Eros for some time. Japanese Poets have pointed out other varieties of Vira and the Habibulata gives a long list of Vira. All this has been set forth already in the section on Shiva Kama. (See above.)

Hibibulata has taken trouble to list Kama-shigai (Ch. II) to prove that Deyatra cannot be included in Kama Kama; there is a confusion here between Kama and Eros.

The Kama-shigai section used previously breaks the usual order of mentioning the Kama and instead of opening with Eros, opens with Vira. The gloss says here that Vira is mentioned first, because it is the softest and fairest of Kama, and the Vira must here is that associated with Eros and Tapa. Towards the end of this section, the text and the commentary divide the Kama into two classes, those related by what are called Sura-doga such as Palahood and Injury to others, and those which do not involve these two. Here Yashikata is considered related by the sin or flow of Injury to another, Paropaghata. Similarly Adhata involves sang-gardha which is a species of Palahood. But such Vira as Tapa and Bhakta is, like the Pranita Kama, free from such Sura-doga.

“यत् त्वं जगत्प्रेतकुली नीलमे कर्तुं । जगत्प्रेतं च । जगत्  
कुलीं तुल्यतादृशित्वे कर्तुं मे ।” ‘यं लोकाधिपं यत् त्वं तुल्यं  
हम् ।’ तुल्यदिग्गजं यत् त्वं तुल्यं तुल्यं तुल्यं तुल्यं  
तुल्यं तुल्यं ।”

एवम अभिप्रायः उपपादात्मकमेव दृष्टव्यमेव विवेच्यते, यत्—

‘य एव अभिप्रायः भावो दृष्टेयः कुर्वितेयः यः ।

विशेषितकृतकैश्च दृष्टिभिरा देवः कार्योद्देश्यः ॥’

एवमित्यन्तर्गते दृष्टं बोधपादात्मकमेवमुक्तम्, वीरसम्बन्धम् । एवमेव  
उपपादात्मकमेव दृष्टव्यमेव वीरसंज्ञा विज्ञेयः । . . . . एवमुक्तमित्यस्य  
वीरसम्बन्धः यथावत्प्रित्तत्वात् अभिप्रायविशेषोपाधीत्यर्थः निवर्तयेदिति ।

In VI, 57, Bharata says that *Śṛṅgārā* is of three kinds, caused by speech (*Vākā*), deed (*Karṇāṭhā*), and physical action (*Kriyā*), and *Hārya* and *Rasāṭhā* also have these three forms. But why should he restrict these three forms to *Śṛṅgārā*, *Hārya* and *Rasāṭhā* only? These three, speech, deed and action, form the three *Abhāṣayā*, *Vākā*, *Kṛtya* and *Āgāṭhā*. The *Hārya* comes under the last. All *Rasā* are caused by these three *Abhāṣayā*. So Māyagopā says—

एवमुक्तं विविधा वृत्तिश्च-मेषान्-सम्बन्धतः ।

एवमुक्तविराजते, बोधोपाधी नैवसम्बन्धः ।

वर्तमानव्यापारद्वयैः वृत्तिभिरा एव दृष्टव्ये ।

कर्तव्यव्यवहारविशेषात्मकमुपनिविष्टः ।

वर्तमानव्यवहारो नैवसम्बन्धः दृष्टव्ये ।

एवमेवव्यवहारो-विवेचनविशेषद्वयैः ।

एवम एववृत्तिभिरा देवः य एव दृष्टव्ये सत्यव्ये ॥

Quoted by Bāṇanātha in his *Vākā*, 57a.

In another connection, i.e., while describing the Sanskrit type of drama, Bharata speaks of three other kinds of *Śṛṅgārā*,—*Dharmā Śṛ.*, *Ārtha Śṛ.* and *Kāma Śṛ.*

*Śṛṅgāraḥ* ३१० *śṛṅgāra* 1 N. S., XX. 33rd Edn. 57a. 75-77; See also the *Māyadūṣa*, p. 123

Śhaṅa postulates a *Śṛṅga* for each *Paropāśa* and relates the resulting four *Śṛṅgas* with the four types of *harṣa*, *Dāmodhita*, *Dāmodhara*, *Dāmodhita* and *Dāmodhara*. Of this, I have spoken fully in the chapter on *Rasa* in my Ph.D. thesis on Śhaṅa's *Śṛṅgāraḥ*.

## VIII

### ARE ALL RASAS PLEASURABLE OR ARE THERE SOME WHICH ARE PAINFUL?

THIS is a very important question into which it is not possible to go completely in this book. It relates to the very theory of the concept of Rasa which is, strictly speaking, out of the scope of this book. While dealing with Hanpith's new and separate Rasa of Vipralambika, it was pointed out that the Rasakāśhī of Rūpānkar also considered Vipralambika as standing in the way of enjoying Rāsa as a purely pleasurable state and that as a matter of fact, Rāsa was both, some Rasas being pleasurable and some painful.

कस्यचिदस्यैवमुपनिषत्सु  
अस्यैवमुपनिषत्सु । न च न च अस्यैवमुपनिषत्सु ।

Rasakāśhī, Mad MS, pp. 51-52.

This question takes us straight into the greater one, why do we see and how do we enjoy a tragedy? What is the relish in Rāsa? This problem, which is still to be solved even in Western literary criticism, cannot be undertaken for discussion here. True, Bhaṭṭa also says

एषा हि त्रुष्टुःशान्तिरस्य ।

Vol. II, Mad MS, 37. Pm., p. 166.

but he evidently means here the *Lāsika* bhāva to which the term *Rasa* is applied by extension. The *Nāṭyaśāstra* also says in 31-109 (p. 115) *प्रागुक्तैश्च* ॥ and proceeds to elaborately prove to the Vytis that some *Rasas* are certainly painful and that our seeing them and enjoying them is really due to the excellence of the art of either the dramatist or of the art of the actor (p. 126).

The majority of the writers do not accept this view at all which means the distinction between *Lāsika* bhāva and the *Rasa*. All the *Rasas* are considered, uniformly and to an equal extent, pleasurable. But it is noteworthy that a writer like *Madhusūdana uśarvati* should hold the view that among *Rasas*, there is a difference of kind. He first adopts the *Śāstrikya* scheme of three groups, *Sattva*, *Rajsa* and *Tamas* : Only *Sattva* can make a *Sādhya* and *Rasa*. In *Krodha*, which is *Rajasa* and *Śoka*, which is *Tamas*, only a shade of *Sattva*-māna, only so much as to make them *Sādhya* and give them the pleasantness of *Rasa*, but the pleasantness or enjoyability is naturally merged in *Krodha* and *Śoka*. Therefore all *Rasas* cannot be relished in the same manner. He says in his *Ekāntasūtra* :

“—द्वैतभावो दण्डयोगोऽयं, नैवेद्या न तदभिधानयोगोऽयं,  
कण्टकानां न दुःखयोगोऽयं, कतिं भवता दण्डयोगोऽयं दण्डयोगो-  
दण्डयोगो, दण्डयोगोऽयं दण्डयोगो । कति न कति, कति दण्ड-  
दण्डयोगः । ” p. 21.

“कोपयोगोऽयं दण्डयोगोऽयं दण्डयोगोऽयं ।

दण्डयोगोऽयं दण्डयोगोऽयं । ” II, 79

After saying this on the basis of the *Śāstrikya*, *Madhusūdana uśarvati* discusses the question from the Vedic

standpoint also. All *bhāva* is of the form of *Brahmānanda*, for *bhāva* is the form of the Brahman. This however does not militate against *rasadharma* things also being *bhāva*, for it is said in the *Upanad* *एतन्मि वासनादयः सन्त वासनाः सन्त-सुखमिवा*.

Though literary enjoyment is superior to *rasadharma* enjoyment, it is still not on a par with *Brahmānanda*. (I, 10-14.) Compared to *Brahmānanda*, *Rasaprānanda* is *Laṭika*. A similar view is propounded by *Śrīmadbhāṣya* also. See *Pīthopaniṣad*, *Intro.* pp. 35-40; pp. 54-5 © © B. Ede. But among literary *Rasas* also, the *Śānta* and *Śānta* are on a par with *Brahmānanda*, for these it is the *Parasūman* and *Rasaprānanda* themselves that are involved in them as *Śānta* and *Rasaprānanda*. The *Advaita* approach is seen in full in Ch. III, where *Madhvānanda* summarizes *rasadharma* his previous *Śānta* *rasadharma* that *Rasa* is varying in degree in its *bhāva* and says expressly that though, in the world, the *Śāntas* are of the forms of *Sukha*, *Dukha* and *Maha*, their counterparts in the *Rāsa* and to the hearts of the spectators, are all of the form of *bhāva* only.

रोमाञ्चिका वचनं वै सुखदुःखविशेषम् ।

वेददुःखिनाम् एतन्मि सुखमविशेषम् ॥ 5.

*Rasaprānanda* begins to spread and dominate as the sole *Viśā* of the *Antarāhara* and *Rasa* is then considered:

सुखदुःखमविशेषं वाच्यं सान्निध्यं यतिः ॥

सामान्यरूपेणैव यन्मि सुखदुःखम् । III, 12-13.



## NEW VYBICHIRIAN AND SETTYRIAN

We have seen how freely later writers debated the question of adding newer Bards to those that Charis gave. But did not writers feel also that there was no flexibility about Charis's list of Vybichirian and Settyrian and their number, thirty-three and eight?

Charis gave the Elders in these sets as Settyrian, Vybichirian and Settyrian. We have already examined and found that all the eight Settyrians become Vybichirians also. Therefore these eight, the Settyrian, must be added to the thirty-three Vybichirians. But when this addition is made, we have to reduce the thirty-three by removing a few which are redundant. Thus when Tala becomes a Vybichiria, there is no need for Vaida; Hupa in its Vybichiria-grade *Shimvata Tala*, *Shimvata* actually gives Tala as the Settyria<sup>1</sup>. *Kayla* removes *Amanga*. This gives us eight and thirty Vybichirians. Further reduction is possible. Among the thirty, we have two Elders, Gila and Irama, one of which will suffice. Not only do they look alike at first sight but prove to be identical also when their descriptions are examined. Another case of repetition is Nidri and Supai; the second is very delicately distinguished from the first.

<sup>1</sup> *Shimvata* *Shimvata* *Shimvata*, etc. *Myra* *Elder*, London, 1911, line 261.

Īśvara describes the latter as *Madhuchandra* and *Śūdrasamāhita*. If two are then removed, we have eight and twenty-eight. Some writers did use the redundancy at least in the case of *Madh* and *Śūdra* and, instead of *Śūdra*, gave a new *Vyākhyāna* called *Śūdra*, as for instance, those whose *Nigamasamāhita*, earlier of the *Niphalakṣanavivāha* (pp. 83-87) follows.

Why did Īśvara classify the *Śūdras* into *Vyākhyāna* and *Śūdras*? Among *Śūdras*, there are only two distinct, *Śūdrya* and *Vyākhyāna*. The *Anubhava*, the twenty *Abhikāna* of *danavā*, *Śūdra*, *Hiva* etc., the eight *Sātrika*, *Śūdra* etc., given as modes of *Vyākhyāna*, the ten *Śūdra Avasthā*<sup>2</sup>—all these are comprehended in the term *Vyākhyāna*. *Śūdra* calls the *Sātrika*, *Śūdra* *Vyākhyāna*:

एव वाच्यताः परिवादि निरीक्ष्यतेऽपिः, यदा-  
सेवेनवाच्यतेऽपिः । (S. P., Ch. vi.)

But out of these numberless scholarly mental states, there are a few which are more major, compared to others; not only are they major, but they are more definitely mental states than others which are physical manifestations. It may

<sup>2</sup> *Śūdras* added in this are *Maṅgalya*, *Madh*, *Śūdras* and *Pariprasa* according to *Abhinava*. See J. O. R. Vol. VI, pp. 328-330, my article on 'Notes quoted in the *Abhinavabīhārī*'. See also *Harasamāhita*, N. A., p. 334, where *Abhinava*'s sentence referring to *Śūdra*'s additions is reproduced. See also *Padmaśrī*'s *Nigamasamāhita* following *Śūdra*'s school, Ch. vi, Śh. 3-4, where *Vāṅmā*, *Madh*, *Maṅgalya* and *Tapana* are given in addition to 20 *Pariprasa* *Sātrika* etc., *Śūdras*, 1011. While following *Vāṅmā*, *Padmaśrī* quotes a writer named *Śūdra*. *Śūdra* added *Vāṅmā*, *Kṛtā* and *Kā* which *Śūdra* omitted. *Vāṅmā* excepts *Śūdra*'s and *Śūdra*'s additions and has, in addition, three more, *Kṛtā*, *Maṅgalya* and *Calpa*. (J. O. R. VI, pp. 329-330.)

*Śūdra* adds three to his S. T. list for his *Madhuchandra* are included in the *Vyākhyāna* Ch. I, p. 109. *Śūdra* *Vyākhyāna* *Śūdra* *Śūdra*, with *Madh* *Śūdra*.)

be asked if the more major among these accessory mental states are only those given by Bhāṣya and if there are not others. It has been pointed out that this list of Bhāṣya can be reduced on one side, and as a matter of fact, it has been added to also on the other side. Śāpa, in his *Sy. Pra.*, omits *Aśmanā* and *Māruṣa* and gives in their place, *Irpi* (which Śāṅkshīpala related) and *Śama* which is needed for the *Śānta* *Rasa* (Ch. vi). In his *S.K.A.*, Śāpa omits among his thirty-three *Vyākhyāna* *Sūtra* which Śāṅkshīpala relates and, instead of adding *Śama* as in his *Sy. Pra.*, takes *Irpi* itself, one of the old *Vyākhyāna* given by Bhāṣya, as the *Śāntya* of *Śānta*. Śāṅkshīpala means the point that there can be more *Vyākhyāna*, sometimes some—*Udāha*, *Sūtra*, *Dāṇḍa*, *Irpi*—but sometimes there are included in some of the thirty-three, with reasons which look sound. *Ekikodita* proposes (Ch. 1)

“*एतं संप्रति स्पष्टं विवक्षितं हि*” (Ch. 2)

and shows its occurrence in *Śāṅkha*, *Kaṇva* and *Hāpa*. But it seems to be possible to include it in Bhāṣya's *śāntya*. (Cf. his description, p. 371, GOS edn N.S. D. Śāpa Goukara, in his scheme of *Madhva* *Rasa*, accepts at first the traditional thirty-three *Vyākhyāna* and adds afterwards thirteen more *Vyākhyāna* generally, as also a few more specially under some individual *Rasa* (Cf. Dr. S.K. De, *IBQ*, 1958, p. 683). Dr. De adds that the thirteen additional *Vyākhyāna* are brought by Śāpa under one or the other of the old thirty-three.

Bhāṣya himself discusses the question of the separate meaning and commentaries of the eight *Sādhakā*. He says: as a matter of fact all *Sādhakā* should have to be “entered into”. *Bhava* is “entering into”; but still this “entering into

the state' is all the more necessary in the case of the eight Sattvikas. For, a test has actually to be asked. See pp. 379-381, GOS. eds. N & L. Bhagya says that in truth all Sattvikas are Sattvikas, because Sattva means 'Mind'.

सत्त्विका इति तत्र एव, यम-सत्त्विकात् । यदुच्यते हि यम-  
सत्त्विकमुच्यते ।

Śrī. Pra., Vol. II, p. 194, MS. MS.  
Śārngadhara also says:

सौम्यं सत्त्विकमुच्यते यथा यमो सत्त्विका- ।

सत्त्विकोऽयं सत्त्विकमुच्यते, सत्त्विकमुच्यते ॥

R. & S., I. 303.

The only writer, now known, to propose a ninth Sattvika, is Bhāradvāja. He proposes Jambhā in his Rāmāyāṇīyaḥ:

युष्मा न जम्भ- सत्त्विको यम इति सत्त्विकः । p. 36.

Bhāradvāja would not have himself as the meaning, 'सत्त्विकमुच्यते' for the word Sattva and partly the separate enumeration of the Sattvikas. For Sattva as understood would apply to the Vyākhyāntas also. So, he interprets Sattva as the 'body'—Jīvaśarīra. Taste, Perception etc. are physical states and as such are distinct from the Vyākhyāntas which are mental states. The former are Sattva, the latter Rāsa.' (Rāmāyāṇīyaḥ).

'Bhagya uses Sattva as meaning also the opposite of mind etc., the physical body, and calls Sattva, Rāsa etc. by the name 'Jambhāyāntas'.' See Ch. XXIV, 3-7 and 16.

सुखं यमोऽयं सत्त्विकः सत्त्विकः । and सत्त्विकोऽयं यम इति सत्त्विकः ।

Adhvaya also says "यमः सत्त्विकः", Abh. Dar., Ch. 7, p. 361, GOS. eds. L.

pp. 32-33 and 7-9). To accord with this, Bāṇadatta defines a Vidura not as a Cāṇakya, but as a "Rasikavācī vidura", which is of two kinds, Abhyantara (Śāṅkya and Vyādhakāya) and Bāhya (Śāṅkya etc.). But to exclude any palpably physical acts, he gives them a different name *Caryā* which, he says, is different from *Vidura*. The difference between the two is that while a *Vidura* like a bear cannot be made to appear according to man's desire, a *Caryā* like *Aṅgīrṣa* and *Aśvamedhaka* is done by man of his own will.

“यः पञ्चकूटिनेत्यर्थेनाद्यौनस्येऽवसत्पत्यः । तेषां यत्त-  
त्कृतमात्मनः । तान्यनुकूलं विहायैव यम इति हि तत्तत्कृतम् । यत्त-  
त्कृतमात्मनो हि न विहायः । तिर्यग् वशीकृतः । यत्तत्कृतिकृतम् ।  
यत्तत्कृतिकृतमर्थं च दुर्भिक्षेभ्यश्च विहीनो वक्षिष्यतीति च । कुम्भा च  
विहायैव यत्ति, तस्मिन्मते विहायैवेति ।”

*Īśvarasiddhānti*, p. 69.

# RASA-SYNTHESIS

## Karupa

This artistic mood has always shown a particular for pathos. It is said that the sweetest songs are often songs of sorrow. The first Karupa is Sanskrit root out of the union of pity. 'प्रेमं कर्मते सः' is a well-known anonymous saying. Anandavardhana says that the quality of sweetness which is the melting of the heart is found in the highest degree in Karupa.

सदुपमाद्वैतं वाति मलयमविमं यमः । Diva. I., II.

But to point out the beauty and appeal of a Rasa is not to do any synthesis. By Rasa-synthesis is meant a reducing of all Rasas to the nature of one, a formulation of one as Prakṛa and the rest as its Vikṛa.

Dr. Anandakṛishṇa ever attempted a Karupa-synthesis, but Bhaskarabhaṭṭa, in his drama, Uṣṇahinastotra, suggested such a synthesis in Karupa. Anandavardhana explains that the Kṛitapada is an aspect of Karupa:

एवमेव हि कर्मते सः मलयमविमं यमिन् 'ह्रीः  
ह्रीःमलयमविमं' इतिमलयमविमं । निम्नोक्तं च एव ह्रीःमलयमविमं  
यमिन्मेव मलयमविममविमं ।

Divya. I., IV, p. 217.







by considering the *Shiva* as the one fundamental *Rasa* of which the other *Rasas* are modifications. He called *Shiva* the greatest *Rasa*, first because of its relation to the best and the greatest *Paraghatya*, *Melaga*. Next, poetic delight called *Rasa* is always of a non-worldly, idealistic, character, shown as it is of all mundane associations, a loneliness, unbounded and infinite bliss, and hence is of the form of *Shiva*.

“एव सर्वरसोऽयं सारस्वरूप सारस्वरूपः, निर्दिष्टो निर्दिष्ट-  
रूपः— ।” *Siddh. Sha.*, VI, p. 340, Gadh. Edn.

Further, the *Shākyas* of *Shiva*, the *Rāman*, is the very substance of all mental activities; it is the one basic *Citra* illumined by the *Rāman* that takes the form of the *Vyptis* of *Shākyas* etc. Thus it is *Shākyas*, it is the *Shākyas* of the *Shākyas*, the *Prakṛti* of which *Ras*, *Hras* and the rest are *Vyptis*. Says *Abhinava*—

एव सर्वशुद्धिनामिरास्यं शुद्धिरास्यम् ।

Gadh. Edn., I, p. 340.

And according to some one known to *Abhinava*, the *Shiva* *Rasa* system is found at the very beginning, even before the *Shākyas* section—

“तत्र च चित्तशुद्धिरित्थं ‘सावित्रात्, सारस्वरूपीभ्याम्,’  
‘सर्वस्वरूपः,’ ‘सर्वोऽयं सारस्वरूपीभ्याम्,’ ‘सर्वोऽयं सारस्वरूपी ।”

Gadh. Edn., I, p. 343

The *Shiva* text found in *Bhakti*, according to some, definitely states the *Shiva*-system in two terms—

एवमिदं सारस्वरूपः सारस्वरूपः शुद्धिरिति ।

निवृत्तिः शुद्धिरिति. शुद्धिरिति सारस्वरूपः ।

तं त्वं विदितवान्वाप्य वाचस्पत्योऽप्यसौ ।

सुखविदितवान्वाप्य न वाचस्पत्योऽप्यसौ ॥

H. S. V., pp. 335-6, Greek Edn. I.

This has already been indicated in the *Śloka Rāsa* section of this paper.

### ABHINAVA-SYŪKTA

When Abhinava was synthesizing the Rāsa in *Śloka*, a similar synthetic spirit was working in *Śloka* who escaped every Rāsa and *Abhinava* as a new *Syūktas* he formulated. He said that at the root of all *Abhinava* lay the poem of *Abhinava*, otherwise called *Syūktas* and *Abhinava*. It is a *Śloka* of the *Rāsa*, and is the result of past good acts. By *Abhinava* is meant a self-consciousness or the sense of 'I' which marks off the cultured from the uncultured. It is that by which not only he himself but for others and other objects also does man have any love. In this sense it is called *Rāsa-rūp*. It is this 'Ego' or 'Self-love' that is the *śloka Rāsa*. Its manifestations are *Rāsa*, *Hrasa*, etc. Thus this basic *Syūktas* is different from the first derivative of that name, the *Syūktas* developed from *Rāsa*. In this *Syūktas*-synthesis is not a synthesis in the last of the eight old Rāsa of *Śloka* and others. This theory finds a brief statement in the fifth chapter of *Śloka's* S. K. J. and an elaborate exposition in his *Śy. Pra.* I have set this forth at great length in my Ph. D. thesis on *Śloka's* *Śy. Pra.*, and here I give only a brief account. The S. K. J. says:

सौख्यविदितवान्वाप्य सुखं त्वं विदितौ ।

वेदविदितवान्वाप्य वेदं त्वं विदितौ ॥

विशिष्टाद्वयत्वार्थं वदन्निबन्धनकालम् ।

वृत्तव्यवस्थामुल्लेख्यतेति चेत्तु वदामहे ॥

(C) V, 276, 1-2, p. 474, M. & Edn.

(See also Note on p. 813 where Shree quotes Dandya and draws out his own theory from Dandya's words. The *Śrī. Pr.* says:

ननु किम् पुनर्विरोधोद्विग्नं वृत्तव्यवस्थामुल्लेख्यते ।

तद्व्यवस्थानिबन्धनीयत्वात् तत्र तुल्यत्वं चेन्न वदामहेति चेत्तु ॥

वदामिदमुक्तत्वात् तत्रोक्तं पुनरेव वदामिदमुक्तत्वेऽपि विधानम् ।

तेनैव तत्रैव वदामिदम् ॥

While Abhinava in his *Śrīrāga* speaks as though he stood on that ultimate ripple-less state of the *Ātman*, Shree, adopting the Śāhikya and a Nyāya phenomenology, took his stand on the *Ātman* with its last shoot of Abhidhāna. To Shree, even *Śrīrāga* would appear only within the world of Abhidhāna; for to him, any *Śhīra* or *Rasa* can be experienced only through Abhidhāna. *Śrāva* as much as *Rasa* is the product of Abhidhāna.

“ . . . तत्र वदामिदमुक्तत्वात्तुल्यत्वेन नूनं । न वृत्तव्यवस्थानिबन्धनं न तत्र । तत्र को वदामहे वदामहे । तेषाम् वदामहेति वदामिदमुक्तत्वात् तद्व्यवस्थानिबन्धनीयत्वात्तुल्यत्वात् वदामिदमुक्तत्वेनैव ॥ ”

*Śrī. Pr.*, *Madh. MS.*, Vol II, p. 156.

What is called *Rasa* is an experience of *Mīra* unconditioned by any cause. So long as there is the knowledge of the state being *Rasa* or *Mīra* or anything else, the spectator

is only in the state of Bhairavi and Bhava., beyond this is the state of Rasa. Says Bhaja :

ब्रह्मकलेदकलवदिव्य वरेव

ये ब्रह्मो भवति ब्रह्मवत् न ब्रह्म ।

ये ब्रह्मवत्तदर्थेन विवर्जितवः

सांस्कृत्यं इति नै कदाचि सौख्यं न

Thus Bhajata, Bhava, Vira—these are but Bhava-states in reality. The truth of Rasa is that it is only one and has no more name than Rasa.

### PREMAN

Side by side with or rather within the Abhinava-Bhajata synthesis, Bhaja formulates a synthesis in Preman also. Preman is love in a fundamental sense lying at the root of Rasa, Soka, Bhakti, etc., at the root of all Bhavas is much the same manner as Abhinava still. If one laughs, it is because he loves to laugh; if he fights, his love is done. Thus all activities go to fulfil a certain love which is innate in man and which explains all his activities; it is this love which makes all his activities a self-fulfilment. Bhaja has three stages of his Rasa,—the Purna rasa, the Madhura rasa and the Utsukh rasa. In the first, it is the one Abhinava; in the second, the one Abhinava has become the forty-nine Bhavas, each growing to its relative climax through its Yuktas, Anubhavas etc.; in the third all these several Bhavas become aspects of Preman, or rather upon this Preman, from which stage again, experience passes into the primary stage of the one Rasa of Abhinava.

" तैः विपद्भ्यस्तपसाभिर्येन कलकपलमूर्धोभिनिवासा श्रीः  
 कलकपदीभिस्तद् वासादभिः (१) श्री वासादादुत्पन्नं देवकीयेन श्रीप-  
 द्मनाः कलकपलम् वासाभ्यस्तपसी नमस्तदीभिस्तै नमस्तीये नमि-  
 त्तिः (२) इत्यमरः (३) इत्युक्ते श्रीपद्मकपदी । श्रीपद्मनि हि एवापि-  
 कलकपिता तैरिहोत्तै नमस्तै नमिस्तपसाः कलकपिभ्य इति देवकीयेन  
 श्रीपद्मनां भवति । "

S. K. K., p. 611.

In the *Śrī Pā.* he adds *तौ तद् विपद्भ्यस्तपसाभिः* | Ch. vi,  
 Vol. II, *Śrī Pā.*, pp. 113-4

The *Pranava-synthesis* took an advocate in Kāshīnā-  
 ṭha, the author of the *Abhidhānāvatāra*, where he says :

देवकी श्रीं तदा कलकपदीयेन कपदीयेन वासाः ।  
 कपदीयेन वासा विपद्भ्यस्तपसाः । . . . . तदा श्रीः—

‘ इत्यमरः विपद्भ्यस्तपसाभिर्येन कलकपलमूर्धोभिनिवासाः ।

श्रीं तदा कलकपदीयेन कपदीयेन वासाः । ’

pp. 147-8, *Vārāṇasī Kā.*

### KASHI-ŚRĪKṚTAN

The *Agripurāṇa* took Bhṛṅga's *Abhidhān*, but instead of saying that Kāśi and all other Śhivas emanated from it, and that Kāśi was the first born of Abhidhān which was itself a product of Abhidhān, and this Kāśi evolved itself into Hima-  
 mā. It further went behind Abhidhān and said that Abhidhān is the first manifestation of Kāśi or Cōśakti which is the manifestation of the Ānanda, the infinite nature of the Supreme Being called Para Brahman.

यदाहं त्वम् अहं यथात्मनोऽहं विद्धुः ।  
 विदुर्मेतु यदाहंमे वैदुर्मे तद्वैदुर्मेतिहम् ॥  
 यदाहं यदाहं यदाहं यदाहं यदाहं ॥  
 यदाहं यदाहं यदाहं यदाहं यदाहं ॥  
 यदाहं यदाहं यदाहं यदाहं यदाहं ॥  
 यदाहं यदाहं यदाहं यदाहं यदाहं ॥  
 यदाहं यदाहं यदाहं यदाहं यदाहं ॥  
 यदाहं यदाहं यदाहं यदाहं यदाहं ॥  
 यदाहं यदाहं यदाहं यदाहं यदाहं ॥  
 यदाहं यदाहं यदाहं यदाहं यदाहं ॥  
 यदाहं यदाहं यदाहं यदाहं यदाहं ॥

A. P., Ch. 339, 340 1-6

#### APPENDIX

Wonder is an essential element in all enjoyment, as much as an emotion. In art and literature, the element of surprise, extraordinaryness, wonder, is present everywhere. The very theme has to be striking; for, when we see an extraordinary situation, do we not describe it as being dramatic? Wonder helps love. Mystery is only reversed wonder. The poet Adithan has in *Vīra* 12 two places; Bhavān describes Adithan as born of *Vīra*. The hold of Adithan on the minds of the audience is fully reached by Bhavān who says that the dramatist must so work out his story, so weave it, hide some and reveal some, that the audience may get at each step a surprise and a thrill. One of the modes which the means to developing the plot called the *bandhānāgama* series is the presentation of the story as a wondrous manner—'यथाहंविदुर्मेतिहम्,' N. 87, XXI, Kāṭ 240, 35 34. There is again the need to

intensely complicate the problems of the story and give out a series of revelations at the end, thus carrying away the heart as the end with their own thrill. This can be realised, for instance, when the closing scene of the *Myōshinshū* on the *Mitsukigawara* is read. The story has to be, says Shikata, in the form of a new's tale, busy at the end, with a crowd of suspense. There must be *Adharta* in the end.

वार्त्तं वेदुषास्त्वं वार्त्तमे कालकालवद्विह्वलम् ।  
 मे वेदुषास्त्वं वेदुषीं वृत्तः कालीः ॥  
 वार्त्तं कालकालं कालकालवदुचिदुचिद्विह्वलम् ।  
 विह्वले वार्त्तमे विलं हि वीरवदुचिद्विह्वलम् ॥

*Shikata, K. A., XX, 46-47.*

Similarly, on the side of verbal expression, the *Vikramaditya*, or the *Vikramaditya* in drama, *Shikata* and *Doddie* made a synthesis in *Adharta* when they praised *Adityashakti* as the one great figure of which the rest are but several images.

हृदयवद्विह्वला तुषारविलम्बिताः ।  
 वीरवद्विह्वलितु वीरवत् कालकालम् ॥  
 वेदा वीर वीरवद्विह्वलितु विलम्बिताः ।  
 वीरवत् वीरवत् वीर वीर वीरवद्विह्वलितु विलम्बिताः ॥

*Shikata, K. A., II, 54-55.*

विलम्बितविलम्बिता विलम्बिता विलम्बिता विलम्बिता ॥

विलम्बितविलम्बिता विलम्बिता विलम्बिता ॥  
 विलम्बितविलम्बिता विलम्बिता विलम्बिता ॥

*Doddie, K. J., II, 274-275.*

This point has been explained at some length by Ananda and Abhinava in the *Edra. K* and the *Locana*, U.d. III, pp. 204-206. The very strangeness of poetic expression is *Aranya* and *Siddhanta*.

२५. . . . . सोमोमीय कृषि संस्थानम् . . . . .  
सोमोमीय वैद्यनिकम् । सैन्य अभियांत्रिकी । सर्वोत्पन्नसंस्थानम् । २६

This Additive or element of surprise characterizes the climax-condition of all the Russ. Additive thus permeates a composition, be it *Altkhite*, *Tsots* and *Russ*.

The popular theory of a synthesis of Rases in Adhitha was however made by an ancestor of the author of the *Sahyadrasangraha*. He was known as Nisthapa. In Ch. 3 of his S. D., Varanashis gives this Adhitha-synthesis in his Yjñ as verse three, in the name of his ancestor, Nisthapa, and hence quotes a verse and a half in that effect from the writing of one Dharmadatta. This Dharmadatta is cited as reviewing Bhag's Sphigira-theory in the *Rasavivahadhi* of Sanyal Man. Bhattacharya, available in a manuscript in the Madras Gov. Oriental MSS. Library (K 1212). P. V. Kane says in his Introduction to the S. D. (p. xvi) that the Dharmadatta was a contemporary of a subsequent Nisthapa who was Varanashis's grandfather and was defeated by the Nisthapa in a debate in the Kalyani court. The Dharmadatta wrote an *Alankāra* treatise in which he stated the theory of

<sup>10</sup> Under *Adkins*, *Bray*, *Blacksheep*, *etc.* in the *Encyclopaedia*.

Source: *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 1997, 92, 1039-1052.

Under Article 1, paragraph 1, in brackets all expressions having an identical meaning.



*Adibhava*-specimens first propounded by the older Mātyasyas. The text of the system is the S. D. runs as follows:

‘आत्मरसिदभिरसिद्धम् विभवमभयम् । कृतज्ञम् च भव-  
निष्ठम् कृतज्ञमभयम् विभवमभयम् विभवमभयम् विभवम् । अत्र  
कर्मणः कर्मणः—

‘तुं कर्मणः कर्मणः कर्मणः कर्मणः ।

कर्मणः कर्मणः कर्मणः कर्मणः ॥ १

कर्मणः कर्मणः कर्मणः कर्मणः ॥ २ ॥ S. D., III.

It is accepted that *Camakita* is *Rasakita*. This *Camakita* is a ‘skip’ of the mind which is in another’s hands. The ‘*Lakshana*’ of all *Rasakita*, accepted on all hands, again points to *Adibhava*. *Rasakita* accepts that in *Śāntika* and other cases there is an element of *Adibhava* as *Śāntika*, where it is *Śāntika*, the *Rasa* becomes *Adibhava* proper.

कर्मणः कर्मणः कर्मणः कर्मणः कर्मणः कर्मणः कर्मणः कर्मणः  
कर्मणः कर्मणः कर्मणः कर्मणः कर्मणः कर्मणः कर्मणः कर्मणः ।

*Rasakita*, Ch. I.

Further, author of the *Rasakita* (p. 40, etc. *Prasanga* of *Śāntika* *Rasakita* *Rasakita*), admits that *Adibhava* system.

‘‘—तुं कर्मणः कर्मणः कर्मणः कर्मणः कर्मणः कर्मणः कर्मणः कर्मणः  
कर्मणः कर्मणः कर्मणः कर्मणः कर्मणः कर्मणः कर्मणः कर्मणः ।  
कर्मणः कर्मणः कर्मणः कर्मणः कर्मणः कर्मणः कर्मणः कर्मणः ।  
कर्मणः कर्मणः कर्मणः कर्मणः कर्मणः कर्मणः कर्मणः कर्मणः ।  
कर्मणः कर्मणः कर्मणः कर्मणः कर्मणः कर्मणः कर्मणः कर्मणः ।

Pośhādāsa goes at length and says in the end that he has selected this theory of 'Adhātva in all Kāsa' as his earlier Akṣarīya work, the Akṣarīyāśāstra, also, which is now available to us now.

On the practical side, Śāstrabhadra's Ākṣarīyāśāstra illustrates the dominating Kāsa of Adhātva, and this has been explained in detail by Professor Miss S. Kappaswami Sastri in her Introduction (pp. 12-13) to the Bāṇanāthaśāstrī edition of this play. The new lost Kṛtyāśāstra also seems to be a play which specialised in Adhātva. Towards the end of the 17th century, young Mahādāsa wrote his Adhātvaśāstra, where his Kāsa is made to say :

असह्यनिष्ठं सारं हि निर्दिष्टं वाच्यम् ।

अद्वैतसारादिः सप्तदीप्यानि सारम् ॥

Kīrtyanīti, 10, 15, 2

Kāsa only One .

It may be granted that an element of wonder enters many Kāsa, but it is absent at least in Kāsa as Pośhādāsa effectively points out. Though Kāshīśāstra is Ūtāśāstra and is called Cāśāśāstra, the Ūtāśāstra is not, in all cases, of the form of an 'enlargement', Vārtikā. There is Vārtikā as in Bīkṣāśāstra, and there is Dvāśāstra as in Śrāṅgāśāstra and Kāśāśāstra. The Dvāśāstra of Śrāṅgāśāstra and Kāśāśāstra is totally absent in Kāśāśāstra, Bīkṣāśāstra, Śrāṅgāśāstra and Adhātvaśāstra, and in this way the Kāśāśāstra is defective. Adhātvaśāstra's Śāstra and Śrāṅgāśāstra's Akṣarīyāśāstra, going to the very substratum of the sections may be extended some validity: so also the sūtraśāstra in Pīṭhāśāstra, Vīṭhāśāstra meaning Pīṭhāśāstra for Ūtāśāstra, and so on.

But though it might be difficult to prove and accept that all the Kasas are but forms of some one of them, it has been recognised by all writers that Kasas as such, the available class, is one: Kasas is Kasas. It has no other name. It is one. It is like the Brahman or the Sphoṭa. The names Śṛiṅgīra, Vāṇī etc. and the consequent plurality and difference are ultimately denied; as they are at best side parts of a whole. Hence it is that Śāstrata also, says Abhinava, uses the singular—

य हि तावद् वदो वदितुमर्थे लपति ।

R. S., V. 29. 373-4.

“—इत एव विविक्तस्वस्वभाववद्विद्वत्पदार्थैः समस्त-  
वचनार्थेन व्याख्येयं वृत्तवाक्यवद् लक्षणीयमित्येवम् । तेन एव एव  
वाक्यं, एव वदति, वदितुमर्थे । तथा च ‘वदति’ (१-१५)  
वृत्तं वचनवचनार्थे । तथा वृत्तवृत्तवाक्यवद् लक्षणीय  
व्यवहारे वा, वदितव्यवहारेण व्यवहारेण व्यवहारे वा, वदितु-  
लक्षणायां लक्षणीयव्यवहारे वा, व्यवहारे लक्षणीयव्यवहारे  
व्यवहारे (१) ।”

ŚSŚ. Edn., Abh., Edn., I, p. 358.

Again, commenting on the Śloka य हि तावति etc., Abhinava says that though names are given to it differently accord-  
ing to its varying conditions, Kasas is fundamentally one, and hence it is that Śāstrata refers to it in the singular number,

पूर्वेन वृत्तवाक्यं वदितुमर्थे वदितव्यवहारेण । एव एव  
लक्षणीयमित्येवम् । एव वदति, वदितुमर्थे । एवं च वृत्तवाक्य-  
व्यवहारे ।

Abh. Edn., I, p. 371.

Abhinava says that *rasaleśa* Rasa and *Rāga* mean the same thing.<sup>1</sup> In experience also we find that our relish is one undifferentiated state of the form of a repose of the mind, *Varṇita*, *Thappa*, *Samānā*, a later commentator on Bhoga's S. R. I., in his exposition of Bhoga's Rasa theory, points out that Rasa as *rasaleśa*, *Śleṣa*, is one.

“*सद्वर्णितं स्वामितं इति कृतं । ताम्रवर्णितं ताम्रवर्णितमिति  
केतुं, विविधैस्त्वद्विधैश्च एव स्वभावता । तस्मिन्मित्राद्विभक्तम्—दीपितं  
कृतम् एव एव स्वभावता ; त्वं न वदितुमिति इति—”*

“*सर्वे (सर्वे) सर्वेण कृतम्(सर्वं) एव एव स्वभावता ।*”

*Man. MS., R. 2499, p. 133.*

Evanschitzky's translation states the point more elaborately and clearly. He considers a certain isolated state of the mind, which is a quality (*Guna*) of the mind established in the *Rasavagya* and completely devoid of any touch of either *Rajaa* or *Tamas*, as the one eternal *Śāntya* and the one eternal *Rasa*. This *Śāntya* called *Rasaleśa* or '*Rasāśāntya*—*rasaleśa*' is separately and diversely named according to the different mental conditions, the *Vibhava*. The difference between this writer and Abhinava and others is that he expressly postulates a *Śāntya* also for the one Rasa which they do not in so many words, though their position implies the one *Śāntya* also.

“*सामान्यतया कृतम्(सर्वं) एव एव स्वभावता ।*

*सामान्यतया दीपितं कृतम्(सर्वं) एव ।*

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *loc. cit.*, p. 133. *दीपितं न त्वं, दीपितं, त्वं, दीपितं* also Abhinava's *śāntya* *Śāntya*! *सामान्यतया दीपितम्* : VII, 17. *Śāntya* *Rasāśāntya*.



सकस्य सप्तम्यवर्षेणैव सकावत्सु, यत्र यत्र हि ।

सप्तमिमेवसप्तम्यवत्सु, सकावत् सकावत् ॥

सकावत् सप्तमिन् यथा सप्तमिसप्तम्यवत्सुसप्तम्यवत्सुसप्तमि-  
निसप्तम्यवत्सुसप्तमिन् यत्र यत्र, तथा सप्तमिसप्तमिन् यत्र यत्र, सप्तम्यवत्सु सकावत् ।

Corr. "सप्तम्यवत्सु सप्तम्यवत्सुसप्तम्यवत्सु सप्तम्यवत्सुसप्तमिन् । यथा  
सप्तमिमेवसप्तम्यवत्सु सप्तम्यवत्सु सप्तमिन् ॥ ॥ तथा सकावत्सु ॥"



## INDEX

#### WORKS AND AUTHORS

[illegible]



	PAGE
<i>Pīṭharāḥ śaṅkṣāṅgāḥ</i>	
<i>śaṅkṣā</i>	144, 145
<i>Uṭṭāṅga</i>	13, 43, 44, 45
<i>śaṅkṣā</i>	107, 108
<i>Uṭṭāṅga</i>	47, 127
<i>Uṭṭāṅga</i>	57
<i>Uṭṭāṅga</i>	1
<i>Uṭṭāṅga</i>	55
<i>Uṭṭāṅga</i>	147, 148, 149
<i>Uṭṭāṅga</i>	45
<i>Uṭṭāṅga</i>	154
<i>Uṭṭāṅga</i>	11
<i>Uṭṭāṅga</i>	53
<i>Uṭṭāṅga</i>	57
<i>Uṭṭāṅga</i>	7
<i>Uṭṭāṅga</i>	35
<i>Uṭṭāṅga</i>	24
<i>Uṭṭāṅga</i>	118
<i>Uṭṭāṅga</i>	119
<i>Uṭṭāṅga</i>	120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129
<i>Uṭṭāṅga</i>	1
<i>Uṭṭāṅga</i>	1, 3, 147
<i>Uṭṭāṅga</i>	24
<i>Uṭṭāṅga</i>	45, 46
<i>Uṭṭāṅga</i>	45, 46
<i>Uṭṭāṅga</i>	120
<i>Uṭṭāṅga</i>	45, 50
<i>Uṭṭāṅga</i>	74, 80
<i>Uṭṭāṅga</i>	5, 45
<i>Uṭṭāṅga</i>	120
<i>Uṭṭāṅga</i>	120
<i>Uṭṭāṅga</i>	12, 141, 142
<i>Uṭṭāṅga</i>	172
<i>Uṭṭāṅga</i>	100
<i>Uṭṭāṅga</i>	12, 43, 44
<i>Uṭṭāṅga</i>	117
<i>Uṭṭāṅga</i>	145
<i>Uṭṭāṅga</i>	45

	PAGE
<i>Uṭṭāṅga</i>	45
<i>Uṭṭāṅga</i>	53
<i>Uṭṭāṅga</i>	45
<i>Uṭṭāṅga</i>	45
<i>Uṭṭāṅga</i>	7
<i>Uṭṭāṅga</i>	34
<i>Uṭṭāṅga</i>	4, 12
<i>Uṭṭāṅga</i>	6
<i>Uṭṭāṅga</i>	31, 43
<i>Uṭṭāṅga</i>	57
<i>Uṭṭāṅga</i>	53
<i>Uṭṭāṅga</i>	53
<i>Uṭṭāṅga</i>	24, 77, 81, 82
<i>Uṭṭāṅga</i>	35, 36
<i>Uṭṭāṅga</i>	118
<i>Uṭṭāṅga</i>	47
<i>Uṭṭāṅga</i>	36
<i>Uṭṭāṅga</i>	74, 84
<i>Uṭṭāṅga</i>	20
<i>Uṭṭāṅga</i>	73
<i>Uṭṭāṅga</i>	71
<i>Uṭṭāṅga</i>	57
<i>Uṭṭāṅga</i>	11, 12, 44
<i>Uṭṭāṅga</i>	45
<i>Uṭṭāṅga</i>	120
<i>Uṭṭāṅga</i>	24
<i>Uṭṭāṅga</i>	50
<i>Uṭṭāṅga</i>	12, 13, 14
<i>Uṭṭāṅga</i>	73
<i>Uṭṭāṅga</i>	20
<i>Uṭṭāṅga</i>	27
<i>Uṭṭāṅga</i>	45
<i>Uṭṭāṅga</i>	27
<i>Uṭṭāṅga</i>	56

	PAGE		PAGE
<i>Patet Cantharidipes</i>	39	<i>Stenocryptidichneumon</i> —Gen-	
<i>Patet cantharidipes affinis</i>	39	erally	
<i>Patet cantharidipes apicalis</i>	39	<b>STENOCRITUS, NORTON, 6.</b>	
<i>Patet</i>	39		2, 3, 9
<i>Patetichneumon affinis</i>	39	<i>Stenocryptus</i> 43, 45, 113, 115	115
<i>Patetichneumon affinis</i>	39	<i>Stenocryptus affinis</i>	117
<i>Patetichneumon affinis</i>	39	<i>Stenocryptus</i>	39
<i>Patetichneumon</i>	7	<i>Stenocryptus</i>	37
<i>Patetichneumon</i>	3	<i>Stenocryptus</i>	37
<i>Patetichneumon</i> 1, 4, 4, 4, 4, 4		<i>Stenocryptus</i>	119
<i>Patetichneumon</i>	39	<i>Stenocryptus</i> 21, 23, 24, 24	
<i>Patetichneumon</i>	7		43, 45, 71, 109
<i>Patetichneumon</i>	3	<i>Stenocryptus</i>	119, 120
<i>Patetichneumon</i>	3, 7	<i>Stenocryptus</i> 113, 124	
<i>Patetichneumon</i>	147		124, 126
<i>Patetichneumon</i>	39	<i>Stenocryptus</i>	31
<i>Patetichneumon</i>	41, 39, 70	<i>Stenocryptus</i>	39
<i>Patetichneumon</i>	7	<i>Stenocryptus</i> (of <i>Stenocryptus</i> )	
<i>Patetichneumon</i>	1, 9	—Genus	
<i>Patetichneumon</i>	39	<i>Stenocryptus</i> (of <i>Stenocryptus</i> )	
<i>Patetichneumon</i> 1, 107, 109, 110,		<i>Stenocryptus</i> (of <i>Stenocryptus</i> )	
	113, 114, 115	<i>Stenocryptus</i> (of <i>Stenocryptus</i> )	
<i>Patetichneumon</i>	43	<i>Stenocryptus</i> (of <i>Stenocryptus</i> )	
<i>Patetichneumon</i> 1, 10, 43		<i>Stenocryptus</i> (of <i>Stenocryptus</i> )	
<i>Patetichneumon</i>	13	<i>Stenocryptus</i> (of <i>Stenocryptus</i> )	
	13, 23, 24, 45, 47, 71, 79	<i>Stenocryptus</i> (of <i>Stenocryptus</i> )	
<i>Patetichneumon</i>	43	<i>Stenocryptus</i> (of <i>Stenocryptus</i> )	
<i>Patetichneumon</i>	13	<i>Stenocryptus</i> (of <i>Stenocryptus</i> )	
<i>Patetichneumon</i>	43, 45, 113	<i>Stenocryptus</i> (of <i>Stenocryptus</i> )	
<i>Patetichneumon</i>	43, 45	<i>Stenocryptus</i> (of <i>Stenocryptus</i> )	
<i>Patetichneumon</i>	113, 124	<i>Stenocryptus</i> (of <i>Stenocryptus</i> )	
<i>Patetichneumon</i>	39	<i>Stenocryptus</i> (of <i>Stenocryptus</i> )	
<i>Patetichneumon</i>	31	<i>Stenocryptus</i> (of <i>Stenocryptus</i> )	
<i>Patetichneumon</i>	31	<i>Stenocryptus</i> (of <i>Stenocryptus</i> )	
<i>Patetichneumon</i>	13	<i>Stenocryptus</i> (of <i>Stenocryptus</i> )	
<i>Patetichneumon</i>	39	<i>Stenocryptus</i> (of <i>Stenocryptus</i> )	
<i>Patetichneumon</i>	39	<i>Stenocryptus</i> (of <i>Stenocryptus</i> )	
<i>Patetichneumon</i> 11, 143, 171		<i>Stenocryptus</i> (of <i>Stenocryptus</i> )	
<i>Patetichneumon</i> (see also <i>Stenocryptus</i> )		<i>Stenocryptus</i> (of <i>Stenocryptus</i> )	
<i>Patetichneumon</i> 11, 43		<i>Stenocryptus</i> (of <i>Stenocryptus</i> )	
<i>Patetichneumon</i> (see also <i>Stenocryptus</i> )		<i>Stenocryptus</i> (of <i>Stenocryptus</i> )	



Region name	PAGE 17, 74	Latin Language	PAGE 23
Bathylagus	7	Vasconithecum	41
Bathylagus	8	Vasconithecum	1
Bathylagus	31	Vasconithecum	32
Bathylagus	35, 144, 152	Vasconithecum	3
Bathylagus	50, 152	Vasconithecum	3
Bathylagus	114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123	Vasconithecum	3
Bathylagus	151, 152, 153	Vasconithecum	3
Bathylagus	154, 155, 156	Vasconithecum	3
Bathylagus	157, 158, 159	Vasconithecum	3
Bathylagus	160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 372, 373, 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 386, 387, 388, 389, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, 455, 456, 457, 458, 459, 460, 461, 462, 463, 464, 465, 466, 467, 468, 469, 470, 471, 472, 473, 474, 475, 476, 477, 478, 479, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 486, 487, 488, 489, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494, 495, 496, 497, 498, 499, 500, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 541, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, 550, 551, 552, 553, 554, 555, 556, 557, 558, 559, 560, 561, 562, 563, 564, 565, 566, 567, 568, 569, 570, 571, 572, 573, 574, 575, 576, 577, 578, 579, 580, 581, 582, 583, 584, 585, 586, 587, 588, 589, 590, 591, 592, 593, 594, 595, 596, 597, 598, 599, 600, 601, 602, 603, 604, 605, 606, 607, 608, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614, 615, 616, 617, 618, 619, 620, 621, 622, 623, 624, 625, 626, 627, 628, 629, 630, 631, 632, 633, 634, 635, 636, 637, 638, 639, 640, 641, 642, 643, 644, 645, 646, 647, 648, 649, 650, 651, 652, 653, 654, 655, 656, 657, 658, 659, 660, 661, 662, 663, 664, 665, 666, 667, 668, 669, 670, 671, 672, 673, 674, 675, 676, 677, 678, 679, 680, 681, 682, 683, 684, 685, 686, 687, 688, 689, 690, 691, 692, 693, 694, 695, 696, 697, 698, 699, 700, 701, 702, 703, 704, 705, 706, 707, 708, 709, 710, 711, 712, 713, 714, 715, 716, 717, 718, 719, 720, 721, 722, 723, 724, 725, 726, 727, 728, 729, 730, 731, 732, 733, 734, 735, 736, 737, 738, 739, 740, 741, 742, 743, 744, 745, 746, 747, 748, 749, 750, 751, 752, 753, 754, 755, 756, 757, 758, 759, 760, 761, 762, 763, 764, 765, 766, 767, 768, 769, 770, 771, 772, 773, 774, 775, 776, 777, 778, 779, 780, 781, 782, 783, 784, 785, 786, 787, 788, 789, 790, 791, 792, 793, 794, 795, 796, 797, 798, 799, 800, 801, 802, 803, 804, 805, 806, 807, 808, 809, 810, 811, 812, 813, 814, 815, 816, 817, 818, 819, 820, 821, 822, 823, 824, 825, 826, 827, 828, 829, 830, 831, 832, 833, 834, 835, 836, 837, 838, 839, 840, 841, 842, 843, 844, 845, 846, 847, 848, 849, 850, 851, 852, 853, 854, 855, 856, 857, 858, 859, 860, 861, 862, 863, 864, 865, 866, 867, 868, 869, 870, 871, 872, 873, 874, 875, 876, 877, 878, 879, 880, 881, 882, 883, 884, 885, 886, 887, 888, 889, 890, 891, 892, 893, 894, 895, 896, 897, 898, 899, 900, 901, 902, 903, 904, 905, 906, 907, 908, 909, 910, 911, 912, 913, 914, 915, 916, 917, 918, 919, 920, 921, 922, 923, 924, 925, 926, 927, 928, 929, 930, 931, 932, 933, 934, 935, 936, 937, 938, 939, 940, 941, 942, 943, 944, 945, 946, 947, 948, 949, 950, 951, 952, 953, 954, 955, 956, 957, 958, 959, 960, 961, 962, 963, 964, 965, 966, 967, 968, 969, 970, 971, 972, 973, 974, 975, 976, 977, 978, 979, 980, 981, 982, 983, 984, 985, 986, 987, 988, 989, 990, 991, 992, 993, 994, 995, 996, 997, 998, 999, 1000		
Bathylagus	151, 152, 153	Vasconithecum	3
Bathylagus	154, 155, 156	Vasconithecum	3
Bathylagus	157, 158, 159	Vasconithecum	3
Bathylagus	160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 372, 373, 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 386, 387, 388, 389, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, 455, 456, 457, 458, 459, 460, 461, 462, 463, 464, 465, 466, 467, 468, 469, 470, 471, 472, 473, 474, 475, 476, 477, 478, 479, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 486, 487, 488, 489, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494, 495, 496, 497, 498, 499, 500, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 541, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, 550, 551, 552, 553, 554, 555, 556, 557, 558, 559, 560, 561, 562, 563, 564, 565, 566, 567, 568, 569, 570, 571, 572, 573, 574, 575, 576, 577, 578, 579, 580, 581, 582, 583, 584, 585, 586, 587, 588, 589, 590, 591, 592, 593, 594, 595, 596, 597, 598, 599, 600, 601, 602, 603, 604, 605, 606, 607, 608, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614, 615, 616, 617, 618, 619, 620, 621, 622, 623, 624, 625, 626, 627, 628, 629, 630, 631, 632, 633, 634, 635, 636, 637, 638, 639, 640, 641, 642, 643, 644, 645, 646, 647, 648, 649, 650, 651, 652, 653, 654, 655, 656, 657, 658, 659, 660, 661, 662, 663, 664, 665, 666, 667, 668, 669, 670, 671, 672, 673, 674, 675, 676, 677, 678, 679, 680, 681, 682, 683, 684, 685, 686, 687, 688, 689, 690, 691, 692, 693, 694, 695, 696, 697, 698, 699, 700, 701, 702, 703, 704, 705, 706, 707, 708, 709, 710, 711, 712, 713, 714, 715, 716, 717, 718, 719, 720, 721, 722, 723, 724, 725, 726, 727, 728, 729, 730, 731, 732, 733, 734, 735, 736, 737, 738, 739, 740, 741, 742, 743, 744, 745, 746, 747, 748, 749, 750, 751, 752, 753, 754, 755, 756, 757, 758, 759, 760, 761, 762, 763, 764, 765, 766, 767, 768, 769, 770, 771, 772, 773, 774, 775, 776, 777, 778, 779, 780, 781, 782, 783, 784, 785, 786, 787, 788, 789, 790, 791, 792, 793, 794, 795, 796, 797, 798, 799, 800, 801, 802, 803, 804, 805, 806, 807, 808, 809, 810, 811, 812, 813, 814, 815, 816, 817, 818, 819, 820, 821, 822, 823, 824, 825, 826, 827, 828, 829, 830, 831, 832, 833, 834, 835, 836, 837, 838, 839, 840, 841, 842, 843, 844, 845, 846, 847, 848, 849, 850, 851, 852, 853, 854, 855, 856, 857, 858, 859, 860, 861, 862, 863, 864, 865, 866, 867, 868, 869, 870, 871, 872, 873, 874, 875, 876, 877, 878, 879, 880, 881, 882, 883, 884, 885, 886, 887, 888, 889, 890, 891, 892, 893, 894, 895, 896, 897, 898, 899, 900, 901, 902, 903, 904, 905, 906, 907, 908, 909, 910, 911, 912, 913, 914, 915, 916, 917, 918, 919, 920, 921, 922, 923, 924, 925, 926, 927, 928, 929, 930, 931, 932, 933, 934, 935, 936, 937, 938, 939, 940, 941, 942, 943, 944, 945, 946, 947, 948, 949, 950, 951, 952, 953, 954, 955, 956, 957, 958, 959, 960, 961, 962, 963, 964, 965, 966, 967, 968, 969, 970, 971, 972, 973, 974, 975, 976, 977, 978, 979, 980, 981, 982, 983, 984, 985, 986, 987, 988, 989, 990, 991, 992, 993, 994, 995, 996, 997, 998, 999, 1000		
Bathylagus	151, 152, 153	Vasconithecum	3
Bathylagus	154, 155, 156	Vasconithecum	3
Bathylagus	157, 158, 159	Vasconithecum	3
Bathylagus	160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 372, 373, 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 386, 387, 388, 389, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, 455, 456, 457, 458, 459, 460, 461, 462, 463, 464, 465, 466, 467, 468, 469, 470, 471, 472, 473, 474, 475, 476, 477, 478, 479, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 486, 487, 488, 489, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494, 495, 496, 497, 498, 499, 500, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 541, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, 550, 551, 552, 553, 554, 555, 556, 557, 558, 559, 560, 561, 562, 563, 564, 565, 566, 567, 568, 569, 570, 571, 572, 573, 574, 575, 576, 577, 578, 579, 580, 581, 582, 583, 584, 585, 586, 587, 588, 589, 590, 591, 592, 593, 594, 595, 596, 597, 598, 599, 600, 601, 602, 603, 604, 605, 606, 607, 608, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614, 615, 616, 617, 618, 619, 620, 621, 622, 623, 624, 625, 626, 627, 628, 629, 630, 631, 632, 633, 634, 635, 636, 637, 638, 639, 640, 641, 642, 643, 644, 645, 646, 647, 648, 649, 650, 651, 652, 653, 654, 655, 656, 657, 658, 659, 660, 661, 662, 663, 664, 665, 666, 667, 668, 669, 670, 671, 672, 673, 674, 675, 676, 677, 678, 679, 680, 681, 682, 683, 684, 685, 686, 687, 688, 689, 690, 691, 692, 693, 694, 695, 696, 697, 698, 699, 700, 701, 702, 703, 704, 705, 706, 707, 708, 709, 710, 711, 712, 713, 714, 715, 716, 717, 718, 719, 720, 721, 722, 723, 724, 725, 726, 727, 728, 729, 730, 731, 732, 733, 734, 735, 736, 737, 738, 739, 740, 741, 742, 743, 744, 745, 746, 747, 748, 749, 750, 751, 752, 753, 754, 755, 756, 757, 758, 759, 760, 761, 762, 763, 764, 765, 766, 767, 768, 769, 770, 771, 772, 773, 774, 775, 776, 777, 778, 779, 780, 781, 782, 783, 784, 785, 786, 787, 788, 789, 790, 791, 792, 793, 794, 795, 796, 797, 798		











	PAGE		PAGE
<b>Toto</b>	108-113	<b>Name</b>	
<b>Paraphrases</b>		Lucius N., Mathura	
Caturanga 17,		N., Mark N., Nigard	
28, 31, 32, 44,		N., Pharyngus N.,	
124, 127, 128,		Pratima N., Puro	
132, 133, 134,		N., Salluvus N.,	
136, 137, 144		Sambhaga N., Sapi-	
Tavaga 22-23		gura N., Sitta N.,	
<b>Paraphrasis</b>		Sitta N., Suttava-	
Arta 21, 120		gura N., Suttava N.,	
Dharm 17, 78,		Suttava N., Vitta	
30, 33, 126, 131		N., Vyasa-sutra N.,	
Kila 29		Vyasa-sutra N., Vy-	
[See also Synonyms]		asa N.	
Maha 17, 18, 78,		<b>Root Name</b> 23, 13	
25, 79, 80, 81,		" in Study of	
82, 83, 84, 71,		<b>Mathura Name</b> 124,	
74, 129, 138, 140		124, 140	
[See Maha-Mata		<b>difference in idea in</b>	
also]		<b>the different Names</b> 126	
<b>Paraphrase (Kila and Vitta) 3</b>		<b>eight Names of all 3, 2,</b>	
<b>Pargataga</b> 35, 40		4, 12, 13	
2		<b>ethical criticism of</b>	
<b>Sam</b>		<b>some Names</b> 34	
any list of names		<b>manifest of some</b>	
Names according to		<b>Names according to a</b>	
some 73, 124-126, 129-130		<b>few names</b> 125	
definition of what Name		<b>Realization</b> 121, 143-145	
is 12, 124, 125, 127, 128		<b>Realization</b> 17	
first treatment of Name		<b>Realist</b> 42	
attributed to Name		2	
before 4		<b>Salluvus</b> 116	
only one 112		<b>Salluvus Name</b> 129	
period of study on the		<b>Santa, lover of, as theme of</b>	
history of 121, 126		Arta 41	
synthesis of all Names		<b>Santa Santa</b> 41	
in use 121-122		<b>Santa, present in all Names</b> 38	
<b>Sam</b>		<b>Samartha</b> 3, 115	
additional Names.—see		<b>Sambhaga (Sambhaga Name)</b>	
especially under Kila		22, 144, 150	
Name, Arta N.,		<b>Sambhaga Name</b> 124	
Arta N., Mark		<b>Sambhaga, in the theory of</b>	
N., Salluvus N., Dya-		<b>Name</b> 126, 144	
lia N., Katuranga N.,			



	PAGE		PAGE
Hydrea		Vidua. Ram.	124
, synthesis of all		Vipera (Viperidae. Ram.)	
Kanas in 107		10, 146-147, 148	
105, 170		Vireo	73-77, 130, 135, 137, 138
Hydrea		, Eliza Vireo 48, 54, 73-77	
, rare that Vireo		130, 135, 137, 138	
about also the		, Dyer Vireo 21, 30, 33,	
became Hydrea		40, 45, 54, 58, 73-77	
and was never 30,		82, 130	
114, 107		, Dyer Vireo 43, 54,	
Hydrea (Hydrea)	24	73-77, 82, 112, 130,	
Hydrea (Hydrea) 146,		135, 137	
148		, Dyer Vireo	30, 130
Hydrea. Ram.	108	, Dyer Vireo	58, 70
Hydrea. Ram.	124	, Dyer Vireo 24, 30, 70	
Hydrea	10	71, 131, 132	
T		Vireo, of other kinds	70-77
Hydrea	7, 8	Vireonidae	30, 33, 38
Hydrea	1-8	Vireonidae. Ram.	140-141
Hydrea (Hydrea) 71,		Vireo	10
71, 82, 40		Vireo	2, 8, 30, 33, 35
Hydrea (Hydrea)	1	Vireonidae	130
Hydrea of India	1	, Eliza Vireo	
Hydrea	130	and Vireo	
Hydrea (Hydrea), and of		130, 137	
Hydrea according to some	30	, and Vireo	
Hydrea	30, 70	and Vireo	
T		from the list	
Hydrea. Ram.	40, 130-132	of	130, 130
Hydrea. Ram.	130-132	Vireonidae	110
Hydrea (Hydrea)		Vireonidae (Hydrea) Ram.	
130, 142, 144		Hydrea	12
Hydrea	101	T	
T		Western literary criticism	115
Hydrea (Hydrea), made of	130		
Hydrea	71, 73, 30	T	
Hydrea (Hydrea-composition)	1		
Hydrea 130, 111, 130, 130,		Hydrea	30, 33
130, 144		Hydrea	77, 82



A. H. 1  
Research Institute

D.G.A.

**CENTRAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL LIBRARY**  
**NEW DELHI**  
Trace traced.

Call No.— 22-21/22-2-1996

Author—Baghat, T.

Title—Number of pages.

Author's Name	Date of Issue	Date of Receipt
<u>M. K. K. K.</u>	<u>19.7.61</u>	<u>2.7.61</u>
<u>Chandrasekhar</u>	<u>19.7.61</u>	<u>2.7.61</u>
<u>Chandrasekhar</u>	<u>19.7.61</u>	
<u>Chandrasekhar</u>	<u>19.7.61</u>	